REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 012 PS 000 229

AN EVALUATION OF DIFFERENCES AMONG DIFFERENT CLASSES OF HEAD START PARTICIPANTS. FINAL REPORT.

BY- HOLMES, DOUGLAS HOLMES, MONICA BYCHOWSKI
ASSOCIATED YM-YWHAS OF GREATER NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER OEO-1271 PUB DATE 31 AUG 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.32 106P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, *COMPARATIVE TESTING, *PARENT ATTITUDES, *CHILD DEVELOPMENT, EARLY EXPERIENCE, DATA COLLECTION, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, COGNITIVE ABILITY, ACHIEVEMENT, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, PARENTAL ASPIRATION, ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES, GROUP RELATIONS, DEMOGRAPHY, LOWER CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, HEAD START, PSI, EXPERIENCE INVENTORY, SEQUIN, STANFORD BINET, N.Y.,

THREE HEAD START PROGRAMS WERE ESTABLISHED TO INVESTIGATE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FOUR GROUPS OF CHILDREN IN THE AREAS OF INTELLIGENCE, COGNITION AND ACHIEVEMENT, ENVIRONMENT, AND PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS. THE FOUR GROUPS WERE (1) THE SR GROUP IN WHICH THE CHILDRENS' PARENTS SOUGHT OUT ENTRY FOR THEIR CHILDREN IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM, (2) THE SAP GROUP IN WHICH THE CHILDREN'S ENTRY INTO THE PROGRAM WAS SOUGHT OUT BY THE HEAD START PERSONNEL, (3) THE SANP GROUP WHO WERE LIKEWISE SOUGHT OUT BY PROGRAM PERSONNEL BUT DID NOT PARTICIPATE, AND (4) THE MC GROUP WHO WERE NON-PARTICIPATING MIDDLE CLASS CHILDREN AVERAGING A YEAR YOUNGER IN AGE THAN THE OTHER THREE GROUPS. GROUPS 1 AND 2 PARTICIPATED IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM ONLY. GROUP 1, 2, AND 3 WERE CHILDREN OF LOWER-INCOME FAMILIES. THE HEAD START PROGRAM LASTED SIX MONTHS. TESTING WAS CARRIED ON IN ALL FOUR GROUPS. ONE BATTERY OF TESTS WAS GIVEN ALL CHILDREN NEAR THE TIME GROUPS 1 AND 2 BEGAN THE PROGRAM. GROUPS 1 AND 2 WERE GIVEN THE BATTERY AGAIN AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PROGRAM. THE RESULTS SHOWED THAT THE MC GROUP SCORED CONSISTENTLY HIGHEST ON ALL TESTS. THE SR GROUP WAS GENERALLY SECOND HIGHEST. THE ENVIRONMENT OF GROUPS 1 AND 4 APPEARED MORE FAVORABLE TO A STIMULATION OF EFFECTIVE LEARNING THAN THE VERY DEPRIVED ENVIRONMENTS OF GROUPS 2 AND 3. ALSO, THE PARENTS OF GROUP 1 AND 4 CHILDREN APPEARED MORE ENCOURAGING TOWARD AND INTERESTED IN THEIR CHILD'S DEVELOPMENT. (WD)

1293

Head Start

ED015012

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF DIFFERENCES AMONG DIFFERENT CLASSES OF HEAD START PARTICIPANTS *

(FINAL REPORT)

Submitted by:

Douglas Holmes, Ph.D.
Director of Research

Monica Bychowski Holmes, Ph.D.
Project Director
and
Principal Investigator

Associated YM-YWHAs
of
Greater New York
33 West 60th St.
New York, N.Y. 10023

Research Department

August 31, 1966

PS000229

---

* The research of which this is a report was supported, in part, by a research grant from Operation Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity (Grant OEO-1271).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I - Introduction 1

II - Method and Procedure 2
- A. Sample 2
  - 1. East Tremont 3
  - 2. Coney Island 5
  - 3. Flushing 5
  - 4. Middle Class 5
- B. Data-Gathering Instruments and Techniques 7
  - 1. Cognitive abilities of the children 7
  - 2. Achievement level of the children 7
  - 3. Experience of the children 7
  - 4. Parental aspirations and expectations 8
- C. Method of Data Collection 9
  - 1. The sought-after samples at East Tremont and Coney Island 9
  - 2. The self-referred samples at East Tremont, Coney Island and Flushing 12
  - 3. The middle class sample 12
- D. Testing Schedule 12

III - Study Hypotheses 13

IV - Results and Discussion: Part I 15
- A. Demographic Data 15
- B. Cognitive and Achievement Test Data: Time I 17
  - 1. The Stanford-Binet 17
  - 2. The Seguin 22
  - 3. The Achievement Test: Caldwell Inventory 24
- C. Experience of the Children: Time I 28
  - 1. The activities of the children 28
  - 2. Companionship at meals 38
  - 3. The living space of the child and the items in it 42
- D. Aspirations and Awareness of the Parents 47
  - 1. Parental job history and aspirations for the child's job and education 48
  - 2. Parental views as regards the function of school and Head Start 51
  - 3. Awareness of and attitude towards community facilities 54

12980

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

V - Results and Discussion: Evaluation of Program Impact: Part II 58
  A. Demographic Data: Flushing 58
  B. Cognitive and Achievement Test Data: Time II 59
    1. The Stanford-Binet 59
    2. The Seguin 65
    3. The Achievement Test: The Caldwell Inventory 66
  C. Experience of the Children: Time II 71
  D. Aspirations and Awareness of the Parents: Time II 71

VI - Conclusions 75

Bibliography

Appendices

12987

TABLE OF TABLES

page

Table 1. Nature of the study samples. 2
2. Status of the initial East Tremont door bell ringing. 4
3. Status of the Coney Island door bell ringing. 5
4. Demographic characteristics of the SR, SAP, and SANP samples at East Tremont and Coney Island. 15
5. Results of the Chi-square analyses (or analyses of variance) of the demographic data between the SR, SAP, and SANP groups. 16
6. Binet IQs and Standard Deviations (T_1) for the SR, SAP, SANP and MC groups. 18
7. Analysis of Variance for Binet IQs. 18
8. Means and Standard Deviations for the five Cognitive Area Scores of the Stanford-Binet (T_1) for the four groups. 19
9. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Binet-sub-scores. 19
10. Results of the application of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the Binet sub-scores. 20
11. Means and Standard Deviations for the Seguin scores of the four groups. 23
12. Analysis of Variance for the Seguin scores. 23
13. Results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the Seguin scores. 23
14. Means and Standard Deviations for the Caldwell Inventory for the four groups. 24
15. Analysis of Variance for the Caldwell Inventory data. 25
16. Duncan Multiple Range Test for the Caldwell Inventory. 25
17. Means and Standard Deviations for the number of different activities engaged in by each of the four groups. 29
18. The results of the Analysis of Variance for the number of different activities engaged in by the four groups. 29

12988

TABLE OF TABLES (cont.)

		page
Table 19.	The results of the application of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the number of different activities engaged in by the four groups.	29 29
20.	Chi-square of "most" activities, TV v. other "good" activities, for MC v. SR, SAP and SANP groups.	31
21.	Chi-square of "most" activities, TV v. other "good" activities, for the SR, SAP and SANP groups.	34
22.	Results of Chi-square analyses of meal-time companionship.	39
23.	Means and Standard Deviations for the data on the child's room.	43
24.	Results of the Analysis of Variance for the child's room.	43
25.	Results of the Duncan Multiple Range test conducted on the data on the child's room.	43
26.	Results of Chi-square conducted on number of child's books.	44
27.	Results of Chi-square analyses of quality of child's books.	45
28.	Chi-square analyses with respect to separate or multiple ownership of toys.	46
29.	Chi-square analyses with respect to quality of the toys.	46
30.	Chi-square analyses of parental job mobility data.	48
31.	Chi-square analyses of data with respect to parental aspiration for the child's education.	48
32.	Results of the Chi-square analyses conducted on the "realistic evaluation" of parents' perception of education needed for a particular job.	49
33.	Chi-square analyses on data of parental aspiration for their children's jobs.	50
34.	Chi-square analyses of data on parental views as to the function of school.	51
35.	Chi-square analyses on data of parental perceptions of function of Head Start.	52
36.	Chi-square analyses of data on ways in which disadvantaged parents learned about Head Start.	52

12989

TABLE OF TABLES (cont.)

Table 37. Chi-square analyses of data on why disadvantaged parents might not join Head Start. 53
38. Chi-square analyses on data of what parents feel is needed in their neighborhoods. 54
39. Chi-square analyses on data of parental awareness of existing community centers, among the disadvantaged groups. 55
40. Chi-square analyses on data pertaining to recency of medical care for the child being tested. 56
41. The demographic characteristics of the Flushing (Fl) Sample. 58
42. The results of Chi-Square analyses of the demographic data between SR, SAP, and Fl groups; the results of the Analyses of Variance conducted on the age and number of siblings for these groups. 58
43. Binet IQs for Standard Deviations for the SR, SAP and Fl groups, at Time I and Time II. 59
44. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Binet IQs for the SR, SAP and Fl groups. 60
45. Results of t-tests for correlated means performed on average total score Binet IQ data for Time I and Time II. 60
46. Means and Standard Deviations for Binet sub-scales for the SR, SAP, and Fl groups, Time I and Time II. 61
47. Results of the Analyses of Variance conducted on the five Binet sub-scales for the SR, SAP and Fl groups. 62
48. Results of t-tests performed on average Binet sub-scales, comparing Time I with Time II. 64
49. Means and Standard Deviations for the Seguin scores for the three groups, Time I and Time II. 65
50. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Seguin data for the SR, SAP and Fl groups. 65

12290

TABLE OF TABLES (cont.)

Table 51. Results of t-tests performed on average Seguin scores, comparing Time I with Time II. 66
52. Means and Standard Deviations for the Caldwell Inventory data for the SR, SAP and F1 groups, Time I and Time II. 66
53. Results of the Analyses of Variance conducted on the Caldwell Inventory data for the SR, SAP and F1 groups. 67
54. Results of t-tests performed on average Caldwell Inventory scores, comparing Time I with Time II. 69
55. Results of Chi-square analyses conducted on data regarding attendance of parent meetings. 72
56. Results of the Chi-square analyses performed on data of how parents feel Head Start prepared child for kindergarten. 72
57. Results of Chi-square performed on data about parental assessment of school readiness.

12991

FINAL REPORT

HEAD START EVALUATION

I - INTRODUCTION

In January of 1966, the Associated YM-YWHAs of Greater New York initiated three six-month Head Start programs, with the support of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

The principal aim of the present research was to investigate certain specific differences among four different groups of pre-school age children and their parents or principal caretakers. These groups were comprised of: (1) children whose parents or principal caretakers on their own initiative seek out Head Start participation for their children (hereafter termed "self-referred"); (2) children who participate in the Head Start program, but whose participation is the result of active reaching out (hereafter termed "sought-after"); (3) children who were contacted by staff during the recruitment procedure, but were not enrolled in the program subsequent to this contact (hereafter termed "non-participants"); (4) a group of non-participant middle class children with no previous nursery school experience who served as a comparison group for certain of the measures.

A secondary aim of the research was to evaluate the impact of program on the participants. Hence all measures were presented to the participants, both self-referred and sought-after, a second time, at the end of the program.

12992

Two of the Associated Y Centers conducted traditional nursery school programs and provided the subjects for the major focus of the study, i.e., the investigation of differences among different classes of participants and non-participants. In terms of the evaluation of program impact, however, data from a third Center, which conducted a Montessori program, has also been used. Hence, data were collected on all of the children (all of whom were self-referred) in the Montessori program at the Flushing YM-YWHA in order to evaluate possible differences in the impact of these two types of programs. Group (5) is comprised of the children in this Montessori program.

II - METHOD AND PROCEDURE

A. Sample:

The entire study population consisted of five groups, as noted above. Table 1 shows the number of subjects in each group.

Table 1. Nature of the study samples.

	East Tremont (Nursery School)	Coney Island (Nursery School)	Flushing (Montessori)	Middle Class	Total
Sought-after participants	21	14			35
Sought-after non-participants	14	15			29
Self-referred	16	12	24		52
Comparison group				30	30

Although we originally planned to have 30 sought-after participants, 30 sought-after non-participants, and 30 self-referred participants, as can be seen from Table 1 the actual study population was considerably larger. With regard to the sought-after participants, all those who were accepted by the Centers were included in the study sample. The number of sought-after non-participants was one less than the number originally planned because of the difficulty, described later in the report, in obtaining this sub-sample at East Tremont. In the case of the self-referred, the extra size of the sample is due to the inclusion of the Montessori group.

Each group will be discussed separately in terms of recruitment and test procedure.

(1) East Tremont: It was decided to take a randomly assigned door to door sample, starting with the blocks closest to the Center and radiating out from it as far as necessary within the normal area of service to obtain adequate samples. In addition to the specific assigned addresses (within which all households were contacted), each interviewer was given a sheet called "Status of Each Door Bell Rung" and was required to keep a record of the day's activities. The categories were as follows:

1. No answer
2. Looked through peephole and wouldn't open the door

3. Noise level so high that the knocking of the interviewer could not be heard
4. Family has no children
5. Children are the wrong age
6. Children are already enrolled
7. The income is too high for Head Start eligibility
8. Children speak only Spanish and are therefore not testable
9. Family agrees to be interviewed.

Table 2 shows the incidence of occurrence in each category:

Table 2. Status of the Initial East Tremont Door Bell Ringing.

No Answer	Peep Hole	Noise Level	No Child	Wrong Age Child	Already Enroll.	Income Too High	Span-ish	Study Subjs.
2,280	96	20	599	715	3	18	690	35

The "no answer", "peep hole" and "noise level" respondents were followed up so as to ensure that our sample was not biased, consisting only of people who happen to stay home during the day. Therefore, when anyone on a floor or on the next floor was seen they were always asked about their neighbors in other apartments. In those instances in which a family was identified which had an eligible child, a return visit was made, in the evenings when required.

(2) Coney Island: Whereas in East Tremont, families live in apartment houses, in Coney Island they live in one and two story houses. Hence the density of population is much less and a wider area was covered. However, since families are often outside, in front of their houses, considerable help was provided by people in the neighborhood. For example, a child playing outside could quickly point out the houses on the block where there were children the right age. Therefore, it was necessary to knock on fewer doors and the sample took less time to obtain. Table 3 shows the incidence of occurrence in each category. The same follow-up attempts were made here as at East Tremont.

Table 3. Status of the Coney Island Door Bell Ringing.

No Answer	Peep Hole	Noise Level	No Child	Wrong Age Child	Already Enroll.	Income Too High	Span-ish	Subjs.
695	-	-	195	185	2	-	80	29

(3) Flushing: All program participants were tested, except in cases where siblings were participants - then only one of the siblings was tested.

(4) Middle Class: The criteria used as a basis for the "middle class" designations were as follows:

(1) the father's occupation had to belong to

12990

Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) category three; (2) he had to have completed at least one year of college. This sample was obtained as follows: the registration forms of three Associated Y Centers which serve predominantly middle class families, were reviewed. Where the forms identified the appropriate level of education, the right job category, and the presence of a child of the appropriate age, the families were telephoned. These calls revealed that virtually all middle class 5 year olds and most 4 year olds are in nursery school. Hence, we decided to interview 3 year olds, as well as 4 year olds. The attitudes of the mother and the nature of the home would be the same for a 3 or a 5 year old; in terms of the children we decided to see how the middle class 3 year old would compare to the disadvantaged 4 or 5 year old. (If anything, this actually works against certain of the study hypotheses.) Once a phone call revealed that there was a 3 year old who was not in nursery school (also a problem!), the mother's cooperation was elicited and an appointment was made for the child to be interviewed in his home. No family refused our request for cooperation.

12991

B. Data-Gathering Instruments and Techniques:

The instruments were geared toward the measurement of three aspects of the children's functioning and one aspect of the parent's or guardian's functioning.

1. Cognitive abilities of the children:

   On the basis of our highly successful experience this past summer (OEO-550), the Seguin Form Board of the Arthur Point Scale and the Stanford-Binet were selected. Not only did these tests discriminate well among children in our previous study, but they seem to tap a wide variety of cognitive functions: general verbal ability, judgement, abstract thinking, and visual organization.

2. Achievement level of the children:

   In order to quantify the nature and scope of the children's knowledge and previous experience, the Caldwell Inventory was administered to all of the children. This inventory was used successfully in certain phases of the nationwide Head Start evaluation conducted this summer.

3. Experience of the children:

   In order to ascertain to what cultural and educational experiences the children have been exposed, an Experience Inventory was specifically designed for the purposes of this study. Its aim was to determine, on the basis of a random sample of occasions, what kinds of experiences the children have been more or less routinely offered. In addition, each child's room was evaluated, as were the quantity and quality of his toys and books. This instrument is appended to this report.

4. Parental aspirations and expectations:

The aspirations held by the parents for their children's future, and their expectations regarding what Head Start can and would do for the children were measured. Parental aspirations for the child were determined both in terms of occupation and education. Occupational aspirations were sought in relation to the scale of occupational prestige as formulated by Hollingshead and Redlich (1958). Educational aspirations were measured in terms of the level of educational attainment hoped for the child.

In addition, the SES-mobility of the major wage earner was determined by ascertaining whether or not his or her present job is more prestigeful than the first job held.

In order to measure expectations with regard to Head Start, the adults were asked to report on what basis they decided to enroll or not enroll their children. In the case of the middle class sample, they were asked what a pre-school experience would have to offer in order to engage their interest.

12995

In the case of the sought-after sample, the adults were asked why they had not enrolled previously. This interview schedule is appended to this report. At the time of re-testing a somewhat different set of questions about Head Start were asked. The re-test form of this instrument is appended to this report.

C. Method of Data Collection:

(1) The sought-after samples at East Tremont and Coney Island.

Trained interviewers with male escorts rang door bells as previously indicated. Once a poverty-level family was found with a child of the right age, the Head Start program participation was solicited. Surprisingly, all but two families (both at East Tremont) indicated an interest in Head Start. It had been expected, initially, that in some cases routine persuasion and explanation would not elicit cooperation and that, in these cases, the mother would be offered $10 for her time. This did not prove to be necessary since, as noted, all but two of the families interviewed expressed great eagerness and willingness to have their children participate in the program. Hence the sought-after non-participant sample is comprised of two families who immediately said they would not send their children and of 27 families who expressed interest, but never actually came to the Center for registration.

13000

The mother was interviewed first and then the child was tested. On many occasions the escorts proved very helpful in playing games with the other children of the family, so as to keep them away from the child being tested. The interviewer filled out all forms, and wrote down (or dictated) verbatim what she observed and what was said. Testing was usually conducted at the kitchen table or on the living room floor. In those instances where the mother was present, but the study child was not, or was sick, an appointment was made for a later date.

Following this initial contact a letter was sent to all families who had been interviewed to let them know on which days intake and registration would take place. A copy of the letter may be found in the appendix. A choice of two days was given to each family. Each family was then seen for intake by the head of the Nursery Program. She checked off each family against a list she had been given of all families who were expected to come. All those who did not come for intake were then considered "sought-after non-participants".

At East Tremont this first procedure produced the following split: there were only five families who did not come, and there were twenty-nine who came. The first 21 of the 29 were taken for program. The remaining eight could not be accepted because of space considerations - we had only expected 15 to be enrolled - so that the "sought-after participant" sample was more than complete. In order to obtain the remainder of the non-participant sample, the interviewers again rang door bells. This time, since we were interested only in those families who did not follow through by contacting the Center, and since there was no way of knowing a priori which ones these would be, the children were not tested. Initial contact was made, the mother was interviewed and a letter was sent saying when intake would take place. Another 40 families were thus contacted, out of these nine did not come to the Center. Their children were then tested and in this manner a sample of 14 non-participants was obtained. In the process tremendous demand for and interest in Head Start was generated throughout the neighborhood. Due to the recruitment process many families came to the Center for intake who simply could not be accommodated. (The Center has placed them on a waiting list for Head Start program this summer.) Certainly in the East Tremont area it has been shown beyond question that a short personal contact, in most instances, produces great interest in hard-core poverty families who had not otherwise made any attempt to enroll their children in Head Start. Since in many Head Start programs registration seems to have been a problem, it may well be that distribution of posters and pamphlets is not an adequate recruitment procedure and that in the future, indigenous personnel could be used to ring door bells and effect a more personal contact.

In Coney Island, the 30 initial contacts produced a split of 14 participants and 15 non-participants. Actually, there were 16 non-participants but one of the mothers refused to have the child tested when a second visit was made for this purpose.

(2) The self-referred samples at East Tremont, Coney Island and Flushing.

Even before program began the families who had already enrolled their children were contacted. All children in the three programs who were not exclusively Spanish speaking were tested. In most cases, the testing was done in the home so as to make testing conditions comparable to those of the sought-after samples. All parent interviews were conducted in the home. Most children were seen before program began and no child was seen later than a week after the beginning of program. East Tremont was the first area completed, Coney Island was the second area, and Flushing was completed last.

(3) The Middle Class sample.

As was described earlier, once the families had been identified, an appointment was made and the child and his mother were interviewed. All testing was done in the home.

D. Testing Schedule:

All children and their families were seen for a first visit before or by the end of the first week of program. In terms of re-testing the appropriate children, the sought-

13005

after and self-referred participants at East Tremont and Coney Island, and the self-referred at Flushing were re-tested during the month of June. All testing was done at the Center where the child was enrolled. The re-interviewing of the East Tremont and Coney Island parents was, in all instances, done in the homes.

III - STUDY HYPOTHESES

1. That the children in the self-referred sample will have significantly higher cognitive test scores, Caldwell Inventory Scores, and Experience Inventory Scores than the sought-after sample. In fact, their test scores may not be significantly lower than the middle class scores.
2. The parents in the self-referred sample will manifest aspirations and expectations which are different than the sought-after sample, and which may be more similar to the middle class sample than to the sought-after sample.
3. That the Head Start eligible non-participant sample will differ significantly from both the self-referred and the sought-after groups, particularly in terms of parental expectations and aspirations, as measured by the study instruments.
4. The reasons or expectations given by the self-referred sample for joining the program will be different than those given by the sought-after sample, and may be more similar to those given by the lower middle class sample

13004

with respect to a pre-school program than it will be to the expectations of the sought-after sample. More specifically, it is predicted that the middle class and the lower class self-referred samples will be more interested in the educational and school preparatory aspects of Head Start and that the sought-after sample will be more interested in the baby-sitting or relief to the guardian aspect of the program.

In addition, the parents of self-referred will be more aware of existing community facilities, and will be more engaged in those aspects of community life which are of service to children, than will be parents in the other disadvantaged groups.

5. That the differences in the degree of impact of program will be found between the sought-after and the self-referred participant samples, along the dimensions measured in this study.

13005

IV - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: PART I

The results pertaining to the first part of the study, i.e., the differences between the sought-after participants, the non-participants, the self-referred, and the middle class will be presented in Part I. It should be noted that these data constitute the basis for testing Hypotheses I through IV. Part II represents the results of the evaluation aspects of the study, constituting the basis for testing Hypothesis V. In this part comparisons will be made between the T_1 and T_2 test scores and responses of the sought-after participants and the self-referred, and the Flushing self-referred samples.

What follows immediately are the results pertaining to Part I. of this research.

A. Demographic Data

Table 4 shows the demographic characteristics of the self-referred (SR), sought-after participants (SAP), and sought-after non-participants (SANP). The middle class was not included in these analyses since, by design, their demographic status is entirely different.

Table 4. The demographic characteristics of the SR, SAP, and SANP samples at East Tremont and Coney Island.

	Age in	Sex		Income		Occup.*			Ethnicity			Mother		Father		Sib-
Status	Mos.	M	F	Welf.	Non-Welf.	3	4	5	PR	Neg.	W	Pres.	Ab.	Pres.	Ab.	lings
SR	56.32	13	16	11	18	3	10	16	1	23	5	27	2	13	16	3.45
SAP	57.11	19	16	18	17	0	7	28	6	19	10	35	0	18	17	4.29
SANP	59.03	13	16	18	11	0	7	22	5	18	6	29	0	14	15	4.20

* These ratings of occupation into Class 3, 4, or 5 are done on the basis of Hollingshead and Redlich (1958).

13006

Table 5 represents the statistical analyses performed on each of the variables to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the demographic characteristics of these samples.

Table 5. The results of the Chi-square analyses (or analyses of variance) of the demographic data between the SR, SAP, and SANP groups.

Dimension	Type Test	df	X^2	P
Sex	Chi-Sq.	2	< 1	NS
Income	"	2	3.60	NS
Occup.	"	4	9.55	$< .05$
Ethnicity	"	4	5.34	NS
Mother Present	"	2	4.19	NS
Father Present	"	2	< 1	NS

Area	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Age	Between Groups	109	2	54.5	< 1	NS
	Error	99.04	90	110.04		
	Total		92			
No. of Siblings	Between Groups	13	2	6.5	2.01	NS
	Error	291	90	3.23		
	Total	304	92			

Inspection of Table 5 shows that the SR group has a somewhat higher job status than the other two groups. This finding supports many of the findings to be reported below which suggest that this group has higher aspirations than the SAP and SANP groups.

13007

B. Cognitive and Achievement Test Data: Time I

1. The Stanford-Binet

The Stanford-Binet data were handled in the following manner. Each child's Stanford-Binet was scored in the standard manner and an IQ was obtained. In addition, many of the sub-tests were divided into areas of cognition which match some of the separate areas recognized on the WISC. These areas were: 1) Judgement, 2) Abstract Thinking, 3) Vocabulary I which involves the more passive tasks of recognition and word naming, 4) Vocabulary II which involves the more active task of word definition, and 5) Motor Skills. The grouping of the sub-tests into each of these five areas is appended to this report.

It was felt that while there might be no global differences in terms of overall IQ, an analysis treating each area of cognition separately might reveal differences which otherwise would be obscured. Hence, in the administration of the Binet all items on each sub-test were given. For instance, even though only 3 out of 5 items had to be passed in order to achieve credit for a sub-test under usual Binet conditions, our testers gave all 5 items on the grounds that there is a difference between a child who knows only 3 out of 5 and one who knows all 5. In scoring into separate cognitive areas these differences were taken into account and one point was assigned for each correct item. A child was given maximum point credit for all tests in a given area below his basal age. This total score for any area was then divided by the child's chronological age and in this manner a score was obtained for each of the cognitive areas for each child.

In Table 6 are presented the Binet IQs and standard deviations for the SR, SAP, SANP and Middle Class (MC) groups.

Table 6. Binet IQs and Standard Deviations (T_1) for the SR, SAP, SANP, and MC groups.

Group	$\bar{X}$ IQ	S.D.
SR	87.9	12.75
SAP	87.2	11.59
SANP	82.3	15.74
MC	120.4	13.09

Table 7. Analysis of Variance for Binet IQs.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between	27515	3	9171.67	50.173	<.001
Within (error)	21753	119	182.80		
Total	49268	122			

In Table 8 are presented the means and standard deviations for the five cognitive areas of the Binet for the SR, SAP, SANP, and MC groups.

13009

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations for the five Cognitive Area Scores of the Stanford-Binet (T_1) for the four groups.

	SR	SAP	SANP	MC
Judgement				
M	5.8	4.5	4.4	10.0
SD	3.62	3.91	4.23	3.61
Abstract Thinking				
M	4.0	3.6	4.1	12.9
SD	2.98	3.89	4.79	8.11
Vocab. I.				
M	41.0	39.8	38.2	51.4
SD	7.2	7.29	3.92	5.8
Vocab. II.				
M	39.9	39.4	35.9	54.4
SD	7.39	5.82	7.41	8.7
Motor Skills				
M	38.1	38.6	35.3	50.4
SD	9.25	8.22	9.23	10.4

The results of the analysis of variance and the Duncan Multiple Range Test are presented below in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Binet sub-scores.

Area	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Judgement	Between	633	3	211	14.07	< .01
	Within (error)	1788	119	15.02		
	Total	2421	122			
Abstract	Between	1867	3	622	21.60	< .01
	Within (error)	3426	119	28.79		
	Total	5293	122			
Vocab. I	Between	3240	3	1080	26.67	< .01
	Within (error)	4818	119	40.49		
	Total	8058	122			
Vocab. II	Between	7068	3	2356	44.13	< .01
	Within (error)	6353	119	53.39		
	Total	13421	122			
Motor Skills	Between	4912	3	1637	19.19	< .01
	Within (error)	9738	119	81.8		
	Total	14650	122			

Table 10. . Results of the application of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the Binet subscores.

Any two treatment means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

a. Judgement subscore.

Group	SANP	SAP	SR	MC	shortest significant range
Means	4.4	4.5	5.8	10.0	
4.4		.1	1.4	5.6	1.95
4.5			1.3	5.5	2.05
5.8				4.2	2.12

b. Abstract thinking subscore.

Group	SAP	SR	SANP	MC	shortest significant range
Means	3.6	4.0	4.1	12.9	
3.6		4.0	.5	9.3	2.69
4.0			.1	8.9	2.83
4.1				8.8	2.93

c. Vocabulary I subscore

Group	SANP	SAP	SR	MC	shortest significant range
Means	38.2	39.8	41.0	51.4	
38.2			2.8	13.2	3.20
39.8			1.2	11.8	3.36
41.0				10.4	3.48

13011

Table 10 (continued)

d. Vocabulary II subscore.

Group	SANP	SAP	SR	MC	shortest significant range
Means	35.9	39.4	39.9	54.4	
35.9		3.5	4.0	18.5	3.67
39.4			.5	15.0	3.86
39.9				14.5	3.99

e. Motor skills subscore.

Group	SANP	SR	SAP	MC	shortest significant range
Means	35.3	38.1	38.6	50.4	
35.3		2.8	3.3	15.1	4.54
38.1			.5	12.3	4.78
38.6				11.8	4.94

13012

As can be seen from inspection of Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 the only major differences, whether in overall IQ or in the separate areas of cognition, occur between the middle class and all other groups. The great discrepancy between the middle class group and the disadvantaged groups is not surprising and only supports the need for Head Start programs. It is noteworthy that the self-referred group did better than the non-participants in Vocabulary II.

This difference offers some support for the hypothesis that the self-referred group of children would do better because they had parents who were somewhat more motivated to teach them and to help them learn.

2. The Seguin

The Seguin scores for each of the four groups are presented in Table 11. The score represents the number of seconds that it takes a child to put all ten forms back in place. In the case of errors or incomplete performance, six seconds was added to the total score for each missed item. (Six seconds was the average amount of time it took to do each item during last summer's Head Start research.)

13013

Table 11. Means and Standard Deviation for the Seguin Scores of the four groups.

GROUP	MEAN	S.D.
SR	66.29	19.36
SAP	75.91	37.88
SANP	98.71	57.04
MC	63.45	24.66

In Tables 12. and 13. are presented the analysis of variance and Duncan Multiple Range tests for the Seguin data.

Table 12. Analysis of Variance for the Seguin Scores.

	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between status	21,026	3	7,008	3.942	< .01
Within (error)	202,898	114	1,779		
Total	223,924	117			

Table 13. Results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the scores obtained on the Seguin.

GROUP	MC	SR	SAP	SANP	shortest significant range
MEANS	63.45	66.29	75.91	98.71	
63.45		2.84	12.46	35.26	21.55
66.29			9.62	32.42	22.68
75.91				22.80	23.44
98.71					

Any two treatment means not underscored by the same line are significantly different, at the .05 level.

13014

As can be seen from inspection of Table 13, the group which did significantly more poorly on the Seguin Test is the SANP group. Once again, it appears that the children in this group, whose parents did not bring them to Head Start even after they had been encouraged to do so, have received less cognitive enrichment in their homes than the children in any other group.

3. The Achievement Test: Caldwell Inventory

The means and standard deviations for each of the five areas of the Caldwell and the total Caldwell scores are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Means and Standard Deviations for the Caldwell Inventory for the four groups.

AREA	MC	SR	SAP	SANP
Comprehension				
Mean	13.45	11.21	9.83	8.46
Standard deviation	2.78	2.9	3.5	3.7
Number				
Mean	7.52	5.32	4.80	4.42
Standard deviation	4.14	2.8	3.28	3.24
Non-Verbal				
Mean	10.62	7.43	6.54	6.89
Standard deviation	2.8	3.16	3.96	3.57
Verbal				
Mean	11.28	7.93	4.91	4.96
Standard deviation	3.95	3.64	4.45	4.48
Total				
Mean	42.86	31.89	26.08	24.75
Standard deviation	10.65	9.79	13.14	13.17

13012

In Tables 15 and 16 are presented the results of the analysis of variance and the Duncan Multiple Range Test for the Caldwell data.

Table 15. Analysis of Variance for the Caldwell Inventory Data.

Area	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Comprehension	Between	392	3	130.67	11.54	<.01
	Within (error)	1,313	116	11.32		
	Total	1,705	119			
Number	Between	166	3	55.33	4.73	<.01
	Within (error)	1,358	116	11.71		
	Total	1,524	119			
Non-Verbal	Between	312	3	104	8.51	<.01
	Within (error)	1,418	116	12.22		
	Total	1,730	119			
Verbal	Between	819	3	273	15.19	<.01
	Within (error)	2,084	116	17.97		
	Total	2,903	119			
Total	Between	5,698	3	18.66	13.32	<.01
	Within (error)	16,254	116	140.12		
	Total	21,952	119			

Table 16. Duncan Multiple Range Test for the Caldwell Inventory.
(Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different at the .05 level)

a. Comprehension

Means	SANP 8.46	SAP 9.83	SR 11.21	MC 13.45	Shortest signif. range
8.46		1.37	2.75	4.99	1.72
9.83			1.38	3.62	1.81
11.21				2.24	1.87

Table 16 (continued)

b. Number.

Means	SANP 4.42	SAP 4.80	SR 5.32	MC 7.52	Shortest significant range
4.42		.38	.90	3.10	1.75
4.80			.52	2.72	1.84
5.32				2.20	1.90

c. Non-verbal.

Means	SAP 6.54	SANP 6.89	SR 7.43	MC 10.62	Shortest significant range
6.54		.35	.89	3.19	1.71
6.89			.54	3.73	1.79
7.43				4.08	1.86

d. Verbal.

Means	SAP 4.91	SANP 4.96	SR 7.93	MC 11.28	Shortest significant range
4.91		.05	3.02	6.37	1.78
4.96			2.97	6.32	1.87
7.93				3.35	1.94

e. Total.

Means	SANP 25.75	SAP 26.08	SR 31.89	MC 42.86	Shortest significant range
25.75		.33	6.14	17.11	5.88
26.08			5.81	16.78	6.44
31.89				10.97	6.57

The results presented in Table 16 are striking. The middle class children did significantly better in all areas of the Caldwell. Considering that their mean age was 44.9 months and that, therefore, they represent the youngest group this again supports all that has been previously written about the cognitive impoverishment of the disadvantaged child. The data also strongly support the notion that children of parents who are both sufficiently aware of community facilities and sufficiently motivated to bring their children to Head Start are less cognitively impoverished than children of parents who are not as aware and motivated. It is noteworthy that in verbal skills which are so highly dependent on interaction with the adult world, and in the total Caldwell scores, the SR children did significantly better than the SAP and SANP children. This finding of a superiority in verbal skills supports the finding discussed previous regarding the SR children's superiority on the active word defining tasks of the Binet. It is further indicative of the relatively superior verbal skills of the SR group that they did significantly better in comprehension than did the SANP children.

In general, the results of the cognitive and achievement test data suggest the following conclusions: 1) The middle class children, although more than a year younger, do better in virtually every area of cognitive functioning than do the disadvantaged children; 2) the self-referred children seem to have some superiority over the SAP children in verbal skills; and 3) the SANP children, although somewhat older than the other children, tend to do the most poorly.

These findings support the original hypothesis that the act of coming to Head Start is no accident and actually reflects a set of higher aspirations and a greater interest in the cognitive development of the child. These differences in the parents are reflected in the actual achievement of their children.

C. Experience of the Children: Time I

As can be seen from an inspection of this instrument, there were essentially three aspects of the children's experience that were questioned. These areas were: 1) the variety of activities engaged in by the children on a daily basis, 2) the identity of the individuals with whom they ate their meals, and 3) the nature and quality of their living space and the items in it.

1. The activities of the children

In this area the first analysis pertains to the variety of activities engaged in by each group. It seems that the more culturally and generally impoverished the children were, the less variety there would be in the activities in which they were encouraged to participate. In Tables 17, 18 and 19 are presented the means and standard deviations, the analysis of variance, and the results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test.

13019

Table 17. Means and Standard Deviations for the number of different activities engaged in by each of the four groups.

GROUP	MORNING	AFTERNOON	SATURDAY	SUNDAY
MC				
Mean	2.27	1.77	2.07	2.00
S.D.	.92	.95	.93	.93
SR				
Mean	2.35	1.59	1.70	1.86
S.D.	1.00	1.01	.80	.91
SAP				
Mean	1.98	1.80	1.94	1.94
S.D.	.99	.84	.92	.84
SANP				
Mean	1.41	1.65	1.76	1.79
S.D.	.60	.66	.80	.71

Table 18. The results of the Analysis of Variance for the number of different activities engaged in by the four groups.

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between times	5	3	1.67	2.01	NS
Between groups	9	3	3.00	3.62	<.05
A x B	10	9	1.11	1.34	NS
Within (error)	397	476	.83		
Total	421	491			

Table 19. The results of the application of the Duncan Multiple Range Test conducted on the number of different activities engaged in by the four groups.

(Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different at the .05 level)

GROUP	SANP	SR	SAP	MC	Shortest significant range
Mean	1.65	1.88	1.91	2.03	
1.65		.23	.26	.38	.23
1.88			.03	.15	.24
1.91				.12	.25

Inspection of these tables shows that the SANP group has a significantly more restricted variety of activities than do the other groups. This finding parallels the general conclusion that the SANP children tend to do most poorly on the cognitive tests.

Another analysis of activities data involved evaluation of that activity which was reported as having been done for "most" of the time period in question. When the child watched television for "most" of the time this was considered to be a minimally stimulating and enriching activity, as compared with engaging in some form of play, being read to, or going someplace outside of the house. Television was regarded as a particularly unstimulating activity in light of the interviewers' reports that in many homes the TV set was tuned into adult soap operas for hour after hour and that the children paid it little attention; however, its being on made everyone, including the child, think that the child had an activity. Unfortunately, we did not specifically ask how much of television watching time involved children's programs; however the data do shed some light on this by implication, as the "good" children's programs are scheduled primarily in the early morning. Thus afternoon TV watching is unproductive due to the absence of child-appropriate programs.

In Tables 20 and 21 are presented the results of the Chi-square analyses for those instances in which the "most" time was spent watching TV and those instances in which the "most" time was spent in some other activity. The results presented in Table 20 show a comparison, at each time period: A.M., P.M., Saturday, and Sunday, between the middle class and every other group. The results presented in Table 21 show a comparison at each time period, between each disadvantaged group compared with every other disadvantaged group.

Table 20. Chi-square of "most" activities, TV v. other "good" activities, for MC v. SR, SAP and SANP groups.*

a. A.M.

Activity	MC	SR	Total
TV	5 (5.8)	13 (12.2)	18
Good	11 (11.2)	21 (21.8)	32
Total	16	34	50

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	MC	SAP	Total
TV	5 (6.1)	16 (14.9)	21
Good	11 (9.9)	23 (24.1)	34
Total	16	39	55

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	MC	SANP	Total
TV	5 (5.2)	9 (8.8)	14
Good	11 (10.8)	18 (18.2)	29
Total	16	27	43

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

* Numbers in parentheses refer to expected frequencies.

13022

Table 20 - continued

b. P.M.

Activity	MC	SR	Total
TV	0 (2.7)	5 (2.3)	5
Good	37 (34.3)	27 (29.7)	64
Total	37	32	69

$X^2 = 6.34$ $P = .05$

Activity	MC	SAP	Total
TV	0 (5.7)	12 (6.3)	12
Good	37 (31.3)	29 (34.7)	66
Total	37	41	78

$X^2 = 12.83$ $P = .01$

Activity	MC	SANP	Total
TV	0 (6.1)	11 (4.9)	11
Good	37 (30.9)	19 (25.1)	56
Total	37	30	67

$X^2 = 16.38$ $P = .01$

c. Saturday

Activity	MC	SR	Total
TV	0 (4.0)	8 (4.0)	8
Good	34 (30.0)	26 (30.0)	60
Total	34	34	68

$X^2 = 9.07$ $P = .01$

13023

Table 20 - continued

c. Saturday - continued

Activity	MC	SAP	Total
TV	0 (4.9)	11 (6.1)	11
Good	34 (29.1)	31 (35.9)	65
Total	34	42	76

$X^2 = 10.33$ P = .01

Activity	MC	SANP	Total
TV	0 (2.7)	5 (2.3)	5
Good	34 (31.3)	24 (26.7)	58
Total	34	29	63

$X^2 = 6.37$ P = .05

d. Sunday

Activity	MC	SR	Total
TV	0 (3.4)	7 (3.6)	7
Good	34 (30.6)	28 (31.4)	62
Total	34	35	69

$X^2 = 7.36$ P = .01

Activity	MC	SAP	Total
TV	0 (4.9)	11 (6.1)	11
Good	34 (29.1)	32 (36.9)	66
Total	34	43	77

$X^2 = 10.33$ P = .01

Table 20 - continued

d. Sunday (continued)

Activity	MC	SANP	Total
TV	0 (3.7)	7 (3.3)	7
Good	34 (30.3)	24 (27.7)	58
Total	34	31	65

$X^2 = 8.79$ P = .01

Table 21. Chi-square of "most" activities, TV v. other "good" activities, for the SR, SAP and SANP groups.

a. A.M.

Activity	SR	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	13 (12.9)	16 (14.8)	9 (10.3)	38
Good	21 (21.1)	23 (24.2)	18 (16.7)	62
Total	34	39	27	100

$X^2 = .121$ P = NS

b. P.M.

Activity	SR	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	5 (8.7)	12 (11.1)	11 (8.2)	28
Good	27 (23.3)	29 (29.9)	19 (21.8)	75
Total	32	41	30	103

$X^2 = 3.574$ P = NS

c. Saturday

Activity	SR	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	8 (7.8)	11 (9.6)	5 (6.6)	24
Good	26 (26.2)	31 (32.4)	24 (22.4)	81
Total	34	42	29	105

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

13025

Table 21 - continued

d. Sunday

Activity	SR	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	7 (8.0)	11 (9.9)	7 (7.1)	25
Good	28 (27.0)	32 (33.1)	24 (23.9)	84
Total	35	43	31	109

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

a. A.M.

Activity	SR	SAP	Total
TV	13 (13.5)	16 (15.5)	29
Good	21 (20.5)	23 (23.5)	44
Total	34	39	73

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	16 (15.4)	9 (9.6)	25
Good	23 (23.6)	18 (17.4)	41
Total	39	27	66

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SR	SANP	Total
TV	13 (12.2)	9 (9.8)	22
Good	21 (21.8)	18 (17.2)	39
Total	34	27	61

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

b. P.M.

Activity	SR	SAP	Total
TV	5 (7.5)	12 (9.5)	17
Good	27 (24.5)	29 (31.5)	56
Total	32	41	73

$X^2 = 1.943$ P = NS

Table 21 - continued

b. P.M. - continued

Activity	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	12 (13.2)	11 (9.8)	23
Good	29 (27.8)	19 (20.2)	48
Total	41	30	71

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SR	SANP	Total
TV	5 (8.3)	11 (7.7)	16
Good	27 (23.7)	19 (22.3)	46
Total	32	30	62

$X^2 = 3.857$ P = < .05

c. Saturday

Activity	SR	SAP	Total
TV	8 (8.5)	11 (10.5)	19
Good	26 (25.5)	31 (21.5)	57
Total	34	42	76

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	11 (9.5)	5 (6.5)	16
Good	31 (32.5)	24 (22.5)	55
Total	42	29	71

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SR	SANP	Total
TV	8 (7.0)	5 (6.0)	13
Good	26 (27.0)	24 (23.0)	50
Total	34	29	63

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

13021

Table 21 - continued

d. Sunday

Activity	SR	SAP	Total
TV	7 (8.1)	11 (9.9)	18
Good	28 (26.9)	32 (33.1)	60
Total	35	43	78

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SAP	SANP	Total
TV	11 (10.5)	7 (7.5)	18
Good	32 (32.5)	24 (23.5)	56
Total	43	31	74

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Activity	SR	SANP	Total
TV	7 (7.4)	7 (6.6)	14
Good	28 (27.6)	24 (24.4)	52
Total	35	31	66

$X^2 = < 1$ P = NS

Inspection of the data presented in Table 20 shows that at every time period, except in the morning, the middle class children spend significantly more time in activities other than TV watching than do the other children. Since most of the good children's programs are in the morning, this suggests that while the middle class child watches TV he is really engaged in a situation in which learning can take

13023

place, whereas when the disadvantaged child watches TV he is spending much of his time engaged in an activity which does nothing to enrich him.

The results presented in Table 21 suggest that there are virtually no differences among the SR, SAP, and SANP groups in terms of the amount of TV watching. The one significant difference between the SR and SANP groups in terms of afternoon TV watching is probably only a chance difference. It supports the general trend for the SANP group to be the most culturally disadvantaged. However, with so many Chi-squares it is most likely that if only one of these is significant this is on the basis of chance.

2. Companionship at meals:

Prior to the analysis of this data, all instances of eating only with siblings were put into one category and all instances of eating with mother and/or father were put into another. The rationale was that it is more generally instructive and rewarding for a child to eat with at least one of his parents than only with the other children in the family. When children eat with their parents there is more apt to be meaningful conversation than when a group of children eat together.

In Table 22 are presented the results of the Chi-square analysis of meal time companionship, for each meal both during the week and on weekends.

13029

Table 22 . Results of Chi-square analyses of meal-time companionship*

a. Breakfast daily.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	12 (15.3)	16 (12.7)	28
SAP	14 (18.0)	19 (15)	33
SANP	18 (15.8)	11 (13.2)	29
MC	33 (27.9)	18 (23.1)	51
TOTAL	77	64	141

$\chi^2 = 6.251$ for 3 df P = N.S.

b. Lunch daily.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	12 (14.5)	16 (13.5)	28
SAP	16 (17.1)	17 (15.9)	33
SANP	15 (14.0)	12 (13.0)	27
MC	25 (22.3)	18 (20.7)	43
TOTAL	68	63	131

$\chi^2 = 1.864$ for 3 df P = N.S.

*Numbers in parentheses refer to expected frequencies.

Table 22 - cont.

c. Dinner daily.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	9 (12.3)	20 (16.7)	29
SAP	10 (14.0)	23 (19.0)	33
SANP	13 (11.9)	15 (16.1)	28
MC	36 (29.8)	34 (40.2)	70
TOTAL	68	92	160

$\chi^2 = 5.983$ for 3 df   P = N.S.

d. Breakfast week-end.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	13 (22.5)	43 (33.5)	56
SAP	28 (26.5)	38 (39.5)	66
SANP	21 (22.5)	35 (33.5)	56
MC	73 (63.5)	86 (95.5)	159
TOTAL	135	202	337

$\chi^2 = 9.378$ for 3 df   P = $<.05$

Table 22. cont.

e. Lunch week-end.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	16 (22.1)	39 (32.9)	55
SAP	29 (27.3)	39 (40.7)	68
SANP	19 (21.3)	34 (31.7)	53
MC	71 (64.6)	90 (96.4)	161
TOTAL	135	202	337

$x^2 = 4.462$ for 3 df P = N.S.

f. Dinner week-end.

	Siblings	Mother or Father	Total
S-R	13 (19.3)	43 (36.7)	56
SAP	18 (22.0)	46 (42.0)	64
SANP	16 (18.2)	37 (34.8)	53
MC	73 (60.5)	103 (115.5)	176
TOTAL	120	229	349

$x^2 = 8.495$ for 3 df P = $< .05$

As is shown in Table 22, there were no significant differences between any of the groups in terms of weekday meal time participation. On weekends, differences become significant at both breakfast and dinner. Inspection of the data suggests that on both occasions, it is primarily the self-referred and the middle class which differ from expected frequencies. The self-referred parents eat with their children more often than would be expected and when they are compared to the SAP and SANP groups this probably reflects their greater involvement with their children. The middle class parents eat less frequently with their children than would be expected. At first this is somewhat puzzling; however, it is quite likely that in the middle class home Saturday and Sunday mornings belong to the parents who sleep late while the children get their own breakfast. Similarly, the dinner hour belongs to the parents who may be dining out or having company after the children are asleep. The mother may in fact sit down with the children and keep them company during their dinner, although she doesn't actually eat until later. Unfortunately, this information is unavailable since we asked only about actual eating together. In general, it seems likely that this is not a good area to tap, unless accompanied by direct observation, since the meaning of the resultant data is too unclear.

3. The living space of the child and the items in it:

The first item observed in this category was the child's room and whether he shared it and/or his bed with anyone else. As can be seen from inspection of page 4 of the "child's experience inventory" the categories range from 1) no separation of sleep or play area, child sleeps with some adult to 5) own room, own bed.

13033

In Tables 23, 24 and 25 are presented the mean and standard deviations, the analysis of variance and the Duncan Multiple Range Test for the data on the child's room

Table 23. Means and Standard Deviations for the data on the child's room.

GROUP	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
MC	4.03	.91
SR	3.14	1.28
SAP	2.54	.97
SANP	2.17	1.05

Table 24 . The results of the Analysis of Variance for the child's room.

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between groups	74	3	24.666	21.751	<.01
Within (error)	135	119	1.134		
Total	209	122			

Table 25 . Results of the Duncan Multiple Range test conducted on the data on the child's room.

Any two treatment means not underscored by the same line are significantly different,at the .05 level.

Group	SANP	SAP	SR	MC	shortest significant range
Means	2.17	2.54	3.14	4.03	
2.17		.37	.97	1.86	.543
2.54			.60	1.49	.572
3.14				.89	.591

13034

Inspection of the data shows that the MC and the SR groups are not significantly different from each other. Children in these groups tend to share their room with one or more siblings, but to have their own bed. This pattern is significantly different from that of the SAP and SANP groups who tend to share not only their rooms, but also their beds with another sibling.

The next item rated was the number of books that the child had. For the purposes of data analysis the data was grouped as follows: no books, less than 5 books, more than 5 books.

Table 26. Results of Chi-Square conducted on number of child's books.

	no books	less than 5	more than 5	TOTAL
SR	7 (9.2)	0 (1.6)	18 (14.2)	25
SAP	18 (10.6)	4 (1.8)	7 (16.6)	29
SANP	16 (10.2)	3 (1.8)	9 (16.0)	28
MC	0 (11.0)	0 (1.8)	30 (17.2)	30
TOTAL	41	7	64	112

$\chi^2 = 54.81$ for 6 df $\quad$ $P = <.01$

Inspection of Table 26, wherein are presented the data with respect to the number of books owned, shows that just as with bed ownership, the middle class and self-referred groups

13053

have a rather similar pattern in which it is far more usual for children in these groups to have more than five books than to have no books. On the other hand the SAP and SANP groups show a greater incidence of "no" book ownership than they do of five or more book ownership.

Following a count of the number of the child's books, the interviewers were asked to rate the qualitative aspects of the books.

Table 27. Chi-Square analyses of quality of child's books.

	adult only	comic books	older sibs. school bks.	children's fiction	TOTAL
SR	1 (.4)	2 (2.1)	2 (3.7)	15 (13.8)	20
SAP	0 (.3)	4 (1.3)	5 (2.4)	4 (9.0)	13
SANP	1 (.3)	3 (1.6)	3 (2.8)	8 (10.3)	15
MC	0 (0)	0 (4.0)	6 (7.1)	33 (26.9)	39
TOTAL	2	9	16	60	87

χ^2 = 22.227 for 9 df   P = $<.05$

Inspection of Table 27 shows once again that there was a significant difference between the middle class and the SR groups on the one hand and the SAP and SANP groups on the other. While the MC and SR groups tend to have actual children's literature, the SAP and SANP groups have less children's literature than expected and a greater frequency of comic books and older siblings' school books.

Table 28. Chi-Square analyses with respect to separate or multiple ownership of toys.

	Separate	Multiple	TOTAL
SR	18 (18.8)	4 (3.2)	22
SAP	20 (20.5)	4 (3.5)	24
SANP	15 (17.1)	5 (2.9)	20
MC	29 (25.6)	1 (4.4)	30
TOTAL	82	14	96

x^2 = 5.172 for 3 df P = NS

As can be seen from Table 28, the Chi-Square analysis with respect to separate or multiple ownership of toys was not significant. The great majority of children in each group owns their own toys.

Table 29. Chi-Square analyses with respect to quality of the toys.

	not on level	few educational	educational appropriate	TOTAL
SR	5 (2.9)	15 (13.1)	4 (8.0)	24
SAP	4 (2.2)	14 (9.8)	0 (6.0)	18
SANP	3 (3.1)	21 (14.2)	2 (8.7)	26
MC	0 (3.8)	4 (16.9)	27 (10.3)	31
TOTAL	12	54	33	99

x^2 = 64.404 for 6 df P= < .01

13051

In Table 29 are presented the data with regard to the quality of the toys. In this instance it seems that the disadvantaged groups are all quite similar to each other and tend to have a greater frequency of non-educational toys than does the MC group. The toys of the MC group tend to be almost exclusively educational and age appropriate.

The data with respect to the child's living space and the main items in it suggest that parents of the self-referred children do follow a more middle class pattern in that they are more likely to give each child a separate bed, and to have at least a few books for each child which are child appropriate. In contrast the SAP and SANP parents offer their children less than do the SR parents. Once again, these data support the hypothesis, which suggests that application to Head Start is borne of other than chance factors, and that it is necessary to develop a specific approach to reach those who do not apply.

D. Aspirations and Awareness of the Parents

In general, the data derived from this questionnaire can be subdivided under three general sub-areas: 1) parental reports on their own job history and their aspirations for the child 's future job and education; 2) parental views as to the function of education and their reasons for participating or not participating in Head Start; 3) their awareness of and attitude toward community facilities and needs.

1. Parental job history and aspirations for the child's job and education.

Table 30. Chi-Square analyses of parental job mobility data.

GROUP	Down	Up	Same	TOTAL
SR	9 (9.7)	5 (6.3)	15 (13.0)	29
SAP	9 (11.7)	9 (7.6)	17 (15.7)	35
SANP	18 (8.7)	3 (5.6)	5 (11.7)	26
MC	4 (9.9)	9 (6.5)	17 (13.6)	30
TOTAL	40	26	54	120

x^2 = 18.488 for 6 df P = <.01

Inspection of the data in Table 30 shows that the SANP group is considerably more downwardly mobile than the SR and SAP groups. This finding is consistent with the general picture of greater apathy and less ability to do something about their life situation.

Table 31. Chi-square analyses of data with respect to parental aspiration for the child's education.

Group	College	High School	Vocational High School	TOTAL
SR	24 (21.5)	4 (6.6)	1 (.9)	29
SAP	22 (25.9)	12 (8.0)	1 (1.1)	35
SANP	15 (21.5)	12 (6.6)	2 (.9)	29
MC	30 (22.1)	0 (6.8)	0 (1.1)	30
TOTAL	91	28	4	123

x^2 22.704 for 6 df P = <.01

13053

The data with respect to parental aspirations for the child's education are quite interesting. As can be seen from Table 31, more of the middle class and, to some extent, the SR parents aspire to send their children to college than would be expected, while fewer of the SAP and SANP parents have this aspiration.

Table 32. Results of the Chi-square analyses conducted on the "realistic evaluation" of parents' perception of education needed for a particular job.

GROUP	Realistic	Unrealistic	No information	TOTAL
SR	11 (12.3)	6 (3.8)	12 (12.9)	29
SAP	7 (14.8)	8 (4.5)	20 (15.7)	35
SANP	4 (12.3)	2 (3.8)	23 (12.9)	29
MC	30 (12.6)	0 (3.9)	0 (13.5)	30
TOTAL	52	16	55	123

$x^2 = 64.338$ for 6 df   P = $<.01$

Moreover, inspection of Table 32 shows that the MC and SR parents are far more likely to be realistic about the amount of higher education required for a particular job than the SAP and SANP parents. This evaluation was included because it seemed important to filter out those parents who were merely paying lip service to higher jobs and education, e.g., a number of parents indicated that they wanted their children to be doctors, but when asked how many years after college this would take they said one year. Such a response indicates that the aspiration is not very real to them.

Finally, the data regarding parental aspirations for the child's job are presented in Table 33.

Table 33. Chi-square analyses on data of parental
aspiration for their children's jobs.

Groups	Middle Class	White Collar	Skilled	Don't Know	Self-Determ.	TOTAL
SR	19 (12.5)	0 (2.4)	4 (1.9)	3 (4.1)	2 (7.10)	28
SAP	18 (14.2)	3 (2.8)	3 (2.2)	6 (4.7)	2 (8.1)	32
SANP	11 (11.1)	7 (2.2)	1 (1.7)	6 (3.7)	0 (6.3)	25
MC	3 (13.2)	0 (2.6)	0 (2.2)	2 (4.5)	25 (7.5)	30
TOTAL	51	10	8	17	29	115

$\chi^2 = 36.976$ for 9 df $\qquad P = < .01$

Ratings of the jobs mentioned were based on Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) scores. Only three categories of jobs were mentioned with sufficient frequency to include them in the data analysis: middle class jobs, white collar jobs, and skilled jobs. In addition "don't know what I'd like him to do" (D.K.) and "he'll do whatever he wants and will make him happy" (self-determination, S.D.) categories were included. The pattern of results is quite interesting. While SR and SAP groups tend to choose middle class occupations, the SANP tend to choose more white collar (lower than middle class) occupations than expected. It is of particular interest to note that the middle class parents rely almost exclusively on the Self-Determination category.

2. Parental views as regards the function of school and Head Start.

Table 34. Chi-square analyses of data on parental views as to the function of school.

Group	Education	Social	Preparation	TOTAL
SR	11 (16.0)	10 (7.2)	6 (3.8)	27
SAP	17 (19.6)	9 (8.7)	7 (4.7)	33
SANP	12 (14.2)	9 (6.4)	3 (3.4)	24
MC	27 (17.2)	2 (7.7)	0 (4.1)	29
TOTAL	67	30	16	113

$\chi^2 = 20.931$ for 6 df $P = < .01$

In Table 34 are presented the data on parental views as to the function of school. In this case the MC is quite different from the other three groups. The emphasis of the MC is on education, whereas the emphasis of the disadvantaged groups is on the social and job preparatory aspects as well as on the educative function.

13042

Table 35. Chi-square analyses on data of parental perceptions of function of Head Start.

Group	Baby-sitting	Educational	Total
SR	10 (9.6)	19 (18.4)	29
SAP	12 (11.2)	22 (22.8)	34
SANP	7 (8.2)	18 (16.8)	25
TOTAL	29	59	88

x^2 = < 1 for 2 df P = N.S.

As can be seen from Table 35, there are no differences among the disadvantaged groups in terms of their perceptions about the function of Head Start. It is important to note, however, that the "baby-sitting" or caretaking function is an important one and might attract more parents to Head Start if it were stressed along with the school preparatory function.

Table 36. Chi-square analyses of data on ways in which disadvantaged parents learned about Head Start

Group	Mass Media	Heard Nothing	People	Prcfessional Agencies	TOTAL
SR	7 (6.1)	3 (10.3)	10 (8.1)	11 (6.5)	31
SAP	7 (5.5)	10 (9.3)	8 (7.3)	3 (5.9)	28
SANP	2 (4.4)	14 (7.4)	3 (5.6)	3 (4.6)	22
TOTAL	16	27	21	17	81

x^2 = 19.776 for 6 df P =< .01

13043

Table 36 shows the way in which the disadvantaged groups learned about Head Start and the number of parents in each group who knew nothing about the program. The contrast between the SR group and the SANP group is especially noteworthy. A striking proportion of the SANP parents knew nothing about the program at all. Moreover, while the SR group tended to hear about the program through other people and through professional agencies, this was not the case with the SANP group. This finding suggests the greater isolation of the SANP group from the community. Again, they seem to be the hardest group to reach. The lack of information among both the SAP and SANP groups is particularly striking since only one middle class mother said she knew nothing about Head Start. In other words, it is apparent that the middle class is better informed about programs available for the disadvantaged than are the disadvantaged themselves.

Table 37. Chi-square analyses of data on why disadvantaged parents might not join Head Start.

Group	No Transp.	No Sitters	Other-D.K.	Combo.	TOTAL
SR	8 (6.2)	5 (5.9)	10 (7.8)	4 (7.1)	27
SAP	5 (6.8)	9 (6.5)	8 (8.7)	8 (8.0)	30
SANP	6 (6.0)	4 (5.6)	6 (7.5)	10 (6.9)	26
TOTAL	19	18	24	22	83

χ^2 = 6.2777 for 6 df P = NS

It is interesting to note, from Table 37, that there were no significant differences among the disadvantaged in reasons given as to why they might not join Head Start. In other words, transportation and lack of baby-sitting facilities for other children are a potential problem for all groups. Hence, it cannot be argued that the SR group sought out program simply because it was easier for them. Rather, the hypothesis that it is a question of motivation receives strong support.

3. Awareness of and attitude towards community facilities.

Table 38. Chi-square analyses on data of what parents feel is needed in their neighborhoods.

Group	Children's Facilities	Municipal Facilities	Both	Don't Know	TOTAL
SR	14 (11.6)	4 (3.9)	6 (8.7)	5 (4.8)	29
SAP	9 (14.0)	3 (4.7)	16 (10.5)	7 (5.8)	35
SANP	9 (11.6)	5 (3.9)	7 (8.7)	8 (4.8)	29
MC	16 (10.8)	4 (3.5)	7 (8.1)	0 (4.6)	27
TOTAL	48	16	36	20	120

$x^2 = 17.550$ for 9 df   P = $< .05$

Table 38 presents the expression among the disadvantaged and MC groups regarding what they feel is needed in their neighborhoods. The data were grouped into child facilities (e.g., schools, playgrounds, etc.), municipal facilities (e.g., police, cleaner streets), mention of both types of facilities,

13040

and an "I don't know" category. It is readily apparent that the MC and SR parents are more concerned with facilities for children than are the SAP and SANP parents. This greater concern with child facilities parallels the previous findings that the SR parents are better informed about what is available and that they act on this information even though it is no easier for them to do so.

Table 39. Chi-square analyses on data of parental awareness of existing community centers, among the disadvantaged groups.

Group	Yes	No	Total
SR	19 (12.9)	8 (14.1)	27
SAP	11 (15.7)	22 (17.3)	33
SANP	10 (11.4)	14 (12.6)	24
TOTAL	40	44	84

x^2 = 8.513 for 2 df P = <.05

While there was no difference among the groups in terms of knowledge about playground facilities there was, as can be seen from Table 39, a difference in terms of knowledge about the existence of a community center. As can be seen readily the SR parents are more likely to be aware of the community center than might be expected, and the SAP and SANP parents are less likely to be aware of this facility.

Table 40. Chi-square analyses on data pertaining to recency of medical care for the child being tested.

Group	Jan-Mar 1966	July-Dec 1965	Jan-June 1965	1964	1963	TOTAL
SR	16 (14.1)	5 (9.1)	7 (3.8)	0 (.5)	0 (.5)	28
SAP	11 (16.6)	17 (10.7)	3 (4.5)	1 (.6)	1 (.6)	33
SANP	8 (10.0)	8 (6.5)	2 (2.7)	1 (.4)	1 (.4)	20
MC	21 (15.3)	6 (9.7)	3 (4.0)	0 (.5)	0 (.5)	30
TOTAL	56	36	15	2	2	111

$\chi^2 = 21.886$ for 12 df $\qquad P = < .05$

In Table 40 are the data pertaining to recency of medical care for the child being tested. As may be seen, both the SR and MC parents are more likely to have taken their child for a recent examination than are the SAP and SANP parents.

In general, the findings in this section support the general hypothesis that the SR parents have higher aspirations for their children, although it cannot be said that these aspirations are expressed in the same way as are those of the middle class. While the SR parents aspire to MC job status for their children, the MC parents are more concerned with self-fulfillment and self-determination. Also, while the MC parents are concerned with the educative function of school, the SR like the other disadvantaged groups are more interested in the mobility enhancing aspects, i.e., social and job preparatory.

The data strongly support the notion that the act of seeking out Head Start is the result of a complex set of aspirations and motivations, rather than being a chance or a situational phenomenon. It is potentially just as difficult for the SR group to come to program as it is for the SAP and SANP groups. Not only does the SR group have a higher set of aspirations, but also SR parents have more awareness of what is available to them in the community, have more contacts within the community, and have a greater readiness to use what is available.

Having seen what differences existed between the children and their parents prior to the inception of program, we can now turn to Part V of the report, in which is presented the evaluation of program aspects of the research.

13043

V - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPACT

A. Demographic Data: Flushing

Since the Flushing data become relevant only for the evaluation of program, their demographic characteristics may now be considered. These data are presented below in Table 41.

Table 41. The demographic characteristics of the Flushing (Fl) sample.

Age in Mos.	Sex		Income		Occup.*			Ethnicity			Mother		Father		Siblings
	M	F	Welf.	Non-Welf.	3	4	5	PR	Neg.	W	Pres.	Abs.	Pres.	Abs.	
53.4	11	13	4	20	4	8	12	3	21	1	24	0	15	9	2.95

*These ratings of occupation into class 3, 4, or 5 are done on the basis of Hollingshead and Redlich.

Table 42a. The results of Chi-Square analyses of the demographic data between the SR, SAP, and Flushing groups.

Dimension	Type test	df	x^2	P
Sex	Chi-square	2	.69	NS
Income	"	2	7.37	$< .05$
Occupation	"	4	7.9	NS
Ethnicity	"	4	9.48	NS
Mother Present	"	2	3.80	NS
Father Present	"	2	1.72	NS

b. The results of the analysis of variance conducted on the age and number of siblings for the SR, SAP, and Fl groups.

AREA	SOURCE	df	MS	F	P
Age					
	Between	2	97.5	2.7857	N S
	Within (error)	85	39.01		
	Total	87			
Number of Siblings					
	Between	2	8.5	2.39	N S
	Within (error)	85	3.56		
	Total	87			

13049

Table 42 represents the statistical analyses performed for each of the variables in order to determine whether or not there were any significant differences among the demographic characteristics of this sample as compared to the SR and SAP samples. The demographic characteristics of those two samples were presented in Table 4 (see page 15 of this report).

As may be seen from Table 42, the Flushing (Fl) sample is different with regard to income. These children have fewer parents on welfare. In other words, they represent a somewhat higher class sample.

B. Cognitive and Achievement Test Data: Time II

1. The Stanford-Binet

In Table 43 are presented the Binet IQs and standard deviations for the SR, SAP and Fl groups. For purposes of comparison, the Time I data are presented again within the same table.

Table 43. Binet IQs and Standard Deviations for the SR, SAP, and Fl grupps.

Group	$\bar{X}$ IQ (T_1)	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ IQ (T_2)	SD	N
SR	87.9	12.75	29	96.25	12.09	24
SAP	87.2	11.59	35	89.94	12.75	28
Fl	96.7	9.35	24	103.25	12.23	20

In Tables 44 and 45 are presented the results of the analysis of variance and t-tests for these data.

13030

Table 44. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Binet IQs for the SR, SAP and F1 groups.

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	3414	2	1707.0	11.64	<.01
B) Between times	1238	1	1238.0	8.44	<.01
Interaction A x B	235	2	117.5	<1	NS
Within (error)	22577	154	146.6		
Total	27464	159			

Table 45. Results of t-tests for correlated means performed on average total score Binet IQ data for Time I and Time II.

Group	t	df	P
SR	2.21	23	<.05
SAP	1.65	27	NS
F1	2.00	19	NS

As can be seen from inspection of these data, the only group which showed significant change over time in this area was the SR group. This supports one of the original hypotheses of the study which was that the SR children would show more immediate benefit from program than would the SAP children. However, it is surprising to note the lack of change among the Montessori F1 group since a classical Montessori program presumably stresses cognition more exclusively than does a more traditional nursery school program. We can only speculate that for some disadvantaged children a more exclusive emphasis on

13051

cognitive achievement does not foster learning to as great an extent as an emphasis on social interaction patterns and skills. It is quite possible that until a child has learned to interact positively and effectively with his teachers and his peers he cannot concentrate adequately on formal learning and achievement.

In table 46 are presented the means and standard deviations for the five cognitive areas of the Binet at T_1 and T_2.

Table 46. Means and Standard Deviations for Binet subscales for the SR, SAP and Fl groups.

a. Judgement

Group	$\bar{X}$ T_1	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ T_2	SD	N
SR	5.8	3.6	29	9.4	3.3	24
SAP	4.5	3.9	35	7.4	3.2	28
Fl	7.0	4.2	24	9.2	3.3	20

b. Abstract thinking

Group	$\bar{X}$ T_1	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ T_2	SD	N
SR	4.0	3.0	29	7.7	5.7	24
SAP	3.6	3.9	35	6.0	5.8	28
Fl	6.0	4.3	24	11.1	4.5	20

c. Vocabulary I

Group	$\bar{X}$ T_1	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ T_2	SD	N
SR	41.0	7.2	29	40.3	4.3	24
SAP	39.8	7.3	35	39.1	5.3	28
Fl	43.1	4.3	24	42.6	4.6	20

13052

Table 46 d. Vocabulary II

Group	$\bar{X}$ T_1	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ T_2	SD	N
SR	39.9	7.4	29	45.3	6.8	24
SAP	39.4	5.8	35	43.0	9.2	28
F1	43.1	6.8	24	47.4	8.9	20

e. Motor skills

Group	$\bar{X}$ T_1	SD	N	$\bar{X}$ T_2	SD	N
SR	38.1	9.3	29	39.8	6.8	24
SAP	38.6	8.2	35	39.6	5.8	28
F1	42.8	5.6	24	41.4	5.1	20

In tables 47 and 48 are the results of the analysis of variance and t-tests for the Binet subscore data.

Table 47. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the 5 Binet subscales for the SR, SAP, and F1 groups.

a. Judgement

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	144	2	72.0	< 1	NS
B) Between times	331	1	331	2.3	NS
Interaction A x B	5	2	2.5	< 1	NS
Error	22073	154	143.3		
Total	22553	159			

Table 47. b. Abstract thinking

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	349.7	2	174.9	8.06	<.01
B) Between times	509.1	1	509.1	23.46	<.01
Interaction A x B	36.1	2	18.1	<1	NS
Error	3347.6	154	21.7		
Total	4242.5	159			

c. Vocabulary I

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	294.67	2	147.34	4.34	<.05
B) Between times	16.59	1	16.59	< 1	NS
Interaction A x B	1.46	2	.73	< 1	NS
Error	5489.15	154	35.64		
Total	5801.87	159			

d. Vocabulary II

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	423.81	2	211.91	3.36	<.05
B) Between times	766.92	1	766.92	12.16	<.01
Interaction A x B	13.88	2	6.99	<1	NS
Error	9714.15	154	63.08		
Total	10918.76	159			

13034

Table 47. e. Motor skills

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	345.99	2	173.00	3.24	<.05
B) Between times	21.97	1	21.97	<1	NS
Interaction A x B	63.09	2	31.55	<1	NS
Error	8210.83	154	53.32		
Total	8641.88	159			

Table 48. Results of t-tests performed on average Binet subscales, comparing Time I with Time II.

a. Abstract thinking

Comparison	t	df	P
SR	2.22	23	<.05
SAP	2.86	27	<.01
F1	4.00	19	<.001

b. Vocabulary I (Non-significant Analysis of Variance)

c. Vocabulary II

Comparison	t	df	P
SR	2.75	23	< .02
SAP	3.03	27	< .01
F1	1.72	19	NS

d. Motor skills (Non-significant Analysis of Variance)

e. Judgement (Non-significant Analysis of Variance)

13033

It is apparent that the greatest impact of program was on the functions of abstract thinking and the more active word-defining aspects of vocabulary. This growth seems to have taken place among SR and SAP groups. While the Fl group did show change in abstract thinking, they showed no change in vocabulary. This lack of parallel change in the Fl group is difficult to interpret. The explanation offered above as to the poor fit between the needs of disadvantaged children and a Montessori program is plausible, but it is too far removed from the data to be conclusive.

2. The Seguin

The Seguin scores for each of the three groups are presented in Table 49.

Table 49. Means and Standard Deviations for the Seguin scores for the three groups, T_1 and T_2.

GROUP	$\bar{X}$ (T_1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	66.29	19.36	27	54.04	18.35	24
SAP	75.91	37.88	35	58.14	19.07	28
Fl	70.60	46.20	24	64.45	29.02	20

In Tables 50 and 51 are presented the results of the analysis of variance and t-tests for the Seguin data.

Table 50. Results of the Analysis of Variance conducted on the Seguin data for the SR, SAP and Fl groups.

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	1889	2	944.5	<1	NS
B) Between times	6500	1	6500	5.38	<.05
Interaction A x B	731	2	315.5	<1	NS
Error	183751	152	1208.9		
Total	193871	157			

13050

Table 51. Results of t-tests performed on average Seguin scores, comparing Time I with Time II.

Comparison	t	df	P
SR	.78	21	NS
SAP	3.35	27	<01
F1	1.42	19	NS

Only the SAP group has made gains in performance. Since there are limits to how quickly the Seguin can be executed, it is possible that the SAP group was the only one with sufficient room for improvement.

3. The Achievement Test - The Caldwell Inventory

The means and standard deviations for each of the four areas of the Caldwell and the total Caldwell scores are presented in Table 52.

Table 52. Means and Standard Deviations for the Caldwell Inventory data for the SR, SAP, and F1 groups.

a. Comprehension

Group	$\bar{X}$ (T_1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	11.2	2.9	28	13.46	2.8	24
SAP	9.8	3.5	35	12.04	2.7	28
F1	11.9	4.5	23	13.75	2.1	20

b. Number

Group	$\bar{X}$ (T_1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	5.3	2.8	28	7.6	1.6	24
SAP	4.8	3.3	35	7.2	4.3	28
F1	6.2	2.8	23	7.6	3.3	20

13028

Table 52. cont.

c. Non-verbal

Group	$\bar{X}$ (T_1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	7.4	3.2	28	8.9	2.7	24
SAP	6.5	4.0	35	7.7	3.1	28
F1	9.0	6.7	23	9.1	2.6	20

d. Verbal

Group	$\bar{X}$ (T1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	7.9	3.6	28	10.4	3.9	24
SAP	4.9	4.5	35	7.6	4.8	28
F1	9.4	4.8	23	9.7	3.6	20

e. Total

Group	$\bar{X}$ (T1)	S.D.	N	$\bar{X}$ (T_2)	S.D.	N
SR	31.9	9.8	28	40.3	10.8	24
SAP	26.1	13.1	35	34.5	13.2	28
F1	36.5	2.8	23	40.1	8.7	20

In Tables 53 and 54 are presented the results of the analysis of variance and the t-tests for the Caldwell data.

Table 53. Results of the Analyses of Variance conducted on the Caldwell Inventory data for the SR, SAP and F1 groups.

a. Comprehension

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	108.79	2	54.49	4.61	$<.05$
B) Between times	184.90	1	184.9	15.66	$<.01$
Interaction A x B	0	2			NS
Error	1795.23	152	11.81		
Total	2088.92	157			

13057

Table 53. cont.

b. Number

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	24.25	2	12.13	1.08	NS
B) Between times	172.1	1	172.1	15.26	<.01
Interaction A x B	6.14	2	3.07	<1	NS
Error	1714.93	152	11.28		
Total	1917.42	157			

c. Non-verbal

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	104.08	2	52.04	4.86	<.01
B) Between times	35.99	1	35.99	3.36	NS
Interaction A x B	11.10	2	5.55	.52	NS
Error	1626.20	152	10.7		
Total	1777.37	157			

d. Verbal

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	388.04	2	199.02	10.57	<.01
B) Between times	157.42	1	157.42	8.36	<.01
Interaction A x B	30.76	2	15.38	<1	NS
Error	2862.78	152	18.83		
Total	3439.00	157			

Table 53. cont.

e. Total

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
A) Between groups	2000.67	2	1000.34	7.15	<.01
B) Between times	2048.73	1	2048.73	14.65	<.01
Interaction A x B	109.74	2	54.87	<1	NS
Error	21252.46	152	139.82		
Total	25411.6	157			

Table 54. Results of t-tests performed on average Caldwell Inventory scores, comparing Time I with Time II.

	Group	t	df	P
a. Comprehension				
	SR	4.18	23	< .001
	SAP	1.65	27	NS
	Fl	1.69	18	NS
b. Number				
	SR	4.16	23	< .001
	SAP	4.62	27	< .001
	Fl	1.25	18	NS
c. Non-verbal				
	SR	2.23	23	<05
	SAP	2.77	27	<.01
	Fl	.52	18	NS
d. Verbal				
	SR	3.60	23	< .01
	SAP	4.98	27	< .001
	Fl	.37	18	NS
e. Total scores				
	SR	5.87	23	< .001
	SAP	8.32	27	< .001
	Fl	.29	18	NS

On the Caldwell, which is far more sensitive to change than the Binet, it is noteworthy and gratifying that the SR and SAP children improved significantly in virtually every area.

From the point of view of evaluation, it certainly seems that the program was successful in producing a short-term change in the actual amount of information and knowledge possessed by the children. From the point of view of the selection of tests to measure change in cognitive functioning as a result of programs of relatively brief duration, it seems that the Caldwell is a most sensitive instrument. Since, on the basis of our experience, it is a test of actual achievement and is sensitive to new learning and since it is relatively easy to administer it is recommended for future use in such evaluative research. On the other hand, the Binet is a far more stable measure and is therefore less sensitive to change. In addition, it was reported by our examiners that the readministration of the Binet was met with considerable resistance on the part of the children. It is not likely that five year old children, especially children who do not value or greatly enjoy intellectual exercise, do their best on a long and relatively dull test, especially when it is readministered after only three months. The readministration of many items was met with "Oh no , not again." Finally, on the basis of our sub-scores, the Binet does not lend itself well to a sub-division into separate areas of cognitive functioning. Specifically, as an examination of the means and standard deviations of sub-scale scores indicates, the distributions were highly skewed. This becomes particularly apparent when one considers that the standard deviation was, at times, almost equal to the mean (in one case it exceeded the value of the mean). This great score variance in the Binet suggests that it is not the most appropriate instrument for this specific application, i.e., using sub-areas of the Binet.

13061

C. Experience of the Children: Time II

In general, it can be said that virtually all of the previously found differences were not found in the T_2 analysis. In fact, the new data on the children's experience indicate a striking similarity between the SR and SAP groups. There were only two new exceptions to this pattern of similarity. The SR parents are significantly more likely to eat dinner with their children on a daily basis, and during the course of program they have bought more toys for their children than did the SAP parents. The only previously found difference which was maintained was the finding that the SR children are more likely to have their own bed than the SAP children. That this difference was found at T_2 again, attests to the reliability of the data since it could hardly be expected that the living arrangements of the families would change as a result of program.

D. Aspirations and Awareness of the Parents: Time II

Once again it seems that in large part the T_1 differences have been obliterated. In fact, the only difference which remains is that the SR parents are still more likely to mention the need for child facilities rather than for municipal facilities. The obliteration of some differences, such as knowledge of a community center, was to be expected. Obviously, the SAP parents now know about the Y since their children have been going there for three months. In general, their participation seems to have made them more aware of their community in its relation to their role as parents, than they were previously.

It was initially expected that the SR and SAP parents would differ in their attendance rates at parent meetings held during the course of program, in what they thought they got out of program, and in what effect they thought program had had on their children. The answers to these questions were analyzed and strikingly few differences emerged. In Table 55 are presented the data on attendance at parent meetings.

Table 55. Results of Chi-square analyses conducted on data regarding attendance of parent meetings.

Group	Attend	Did not Attend	Total
SR	22 (18.3)	1 (4.7)	23
SAP	21 (24.7)	10 (6.3)	31
TOTAL	43	11	54

X^2 = 6.39 for 1 df P = $<.02$

In Table 56 are presented the data relating to parental perception of the function of Head Start.

Table 56. Results of the Chi-square analyses performed on data of how parents feel Head Start prepared child for kindergarten.

Group	Behavior	Education	Social	Independence	Total
SR	2 (2.2)	4 (7.1)	5 (6.0)	8 (3.7)	19
SAP	4 (3.8)	15 (11.9)	11 (10.0)	2 (6.3)	32
TOTAL	6	19	16	10	51

X^2 = 10.38 for 3 df P = $<.02$

These data are interesting in that the emphasis of the SR parents on independence, rather than on education, suggests a greater psychological sensitivity rather than lip service to what everyone says about Head Start. Their emphasis on independence may be analagous to the MC emphasis on "self-determination" in the choice of job. This is of course merely speculative, but the difference between the SR and SAP groups in this respect is noteworthy.

Table 57 shows the parents' evaluation as to whether they feel their children are ready to start school or not.

Table 57. Results of Chi-square performed on data about parental assessment of school readiness.

Group	Ready	Not Ready	Total
SR	19 (20.8)	3 (1.2)	22
SAP	32 (30.2)	0 (1.8)	32
TOTAL	51	3	54

$x^2 = 4.76$ $P = < .05$

SR parents are somewhat more likely to feel that their children are not yet ready. It is impossible to say whether this again reflects a greater psychological sensitivity or a more realistic view of the situation.

No other differences emerged with regard to questions about what Head Start had done for the child, whether program produced differences in home behavior, and whether the friendships made during program were being continued or not.

In summary, it seems that by the end of program the differences between the SR and SAP parents were not very great. Perhaps the SR parents are somewhat more sensitive to their children at the end of program, but in general it can be said that the differences between these parents are minimal. This is a rather encouraging conclusion and supports our over-all impression that active recruitment to Head Start should be an important aspect of any program.

13109

VI - CONCLUSIONS

In order to facilitate presentation, each hypothesis and the conclusions relating to it will be discussed separately.

The first hypothesis was that the children in the self-referred sample would have significantly higher Binet, Seguin, Caldwell, and Experience Inventory scores than would children in the sought-after samples. It was further suggested that self-referred scores might not be significantly lower than those of the middle class.

Results showed that, with regard to the three tests of cognition, the self-referred are not similar to the middle class. The middle class child, even when he is a year younger, does significantly better in all areas of cognitive functioning, both verbal and non-verbal.

In terms of experience, the middle class child watches less television than does the self-referred child and is likely to spend his time in more productive activities. The self-referred child is, however, more similar to the middle class child than to his other disadvantaged peers on some important aspects of his living space: he is more likely to sleep in his own bed, and he is more likely to have at least a few books which are age appropriate and educational.

In other words, it cannot be said that the self-referred child is like the middle class child; however, he does approach the middle class child in some respects. The self-referred child does better than his disadvantaged sought-after peers with regard to Vocabulary in the Stanford-Binet, and Verbal tasks on the Caldwell. Hence, the self-referred child appears to have a better set of verbal skills. In terms of living space, his disadvantaged sought-after peers are more likely to share a bed with another sibling and more likely to live in a home where there are no books. If there are a few books they are more likely to be comic books or older sibling's school books, than to be age appropriate. From this it is apparent that the disadvantaged population is not homogeneous: that there is a sub-group, here identified as "self-referred", which is more similar to the middle class in some vital respects.

The second hypothesis was that the parents in the self-referred sample would manifest aspirations and expectations which are different from those of the sought-after samples. It was further suggested that these parents might be more similar to the middle class than to the other groups of disadvantaged parents, in terms of the specific study dimensions.

Study data indicate the following. While self-referred parents differ from middle class parents in some important respects, there are again certain definite similarities. Moreover, once again the absence of homogeneity among the disadvantaged group is striking and noteworthy. Like the middle class, self-referred parents want their children to have a college education and they are more informed and realistic

13001

about how much education is needed for a particular kind of job. However, while the middle class parent is apt to feel that the choice of job should be up to the child, the self-referred parent arbitrarily picks a job of middle class status for his child. Like the middle class parent, the self-referred parent is more likely to be aware of community facilities and is more likely to wish for the creation of new, specifically child-oriented, rather than general municipal, facilities.

In contrast to this profile of the self-referred parent, other disadvantaged parents are less likely to aspire to a college education for the children, are less realistic about the relation between type of job and amount of education, are less aware of facilities in community, and are more likely to stress municipal rather than child-oriented facilities.

The third hypothesis stated that the sought-after non-participant group would differ significantly from both the self-referred and the sought-after participant groups, particularly in terms of parental aspirations and expectations.

In general this hypothesis has been supported. The sought-after non-participant child is less verbal than the self-referred child, and he has a significantly lower score on a simple test of visual-motor organization than the children in any other group. As was predicted, the differences among the parents are the most striking. The sought-after non-participant parent is more poorly informed, less aware of community

13008

facilities, has a lower occupational status, is more downwardly mobile, and has lower job aspirations for his child than does a parent from other disadvantaged sub-groups.

The fourth hypothesis stated that the reasons or expectations given by the self-referred sample for joining the program would be different from those given by the sought-after participant sample. It was further suggested that self-referred parents might be more like middle class parents than like sought-after participant and sought-after non-participant parents in terms of what they look for in pre-school education.

The data did not support this hypothesis. Both self-referred and sought-after participant parents stressed the educational aspects of Head Start, more than the "baby-sitting" or child-care aspects. However, it is important to note, in terms of future planning and approach to recruitment, that for both groups the child-care aspects of Head Start are very important. While the middle class parent tends to stress the educative aspects of school the disadvantaged parent stresses the social and job preparatory, as well as the educative aspects. With respect to this area, the disadvantaged, at least those who participate in program, are relatively homogeneous in terms of their reasons for participation and the expected outcome of that participation.

The fifth study hypothesis stated that there would be differences in the degree of impact of program between the self-referred and sought-after participant groups.

In general this hypothesis was borne out. Perhaps the most striking impact of program was to reduce virtually all of the initial differences between the self-referred and sought-after participant parents. Apparently the parent meetings and the encouragement on the part of Y staff produced a considerable amount of parent participation which had a profound effect on the sought-after participant parents. In this regard, it is interesting to speculate that whereas among the sought-after group some professional work with parents is necessary, such might not be the case among the self-referred, who would participate in meaningful organized parent activities of their own accord. Moreover, it might be possible to use the self-referred group as aides in working with the sought-after groups.

In terms of the cognitive evaluation both groups of children quite clearly gained a great deal from program in that they acquired a specific amount of new information, as measured by the Caldwell. In addition, the sought-after participant children improved in their performance on the Seguin, while the self-referred children showed a gain in their Binet IQs.

While no specific hypothesis had been formulated concerning the impact of the Montessori program, it was expected that this program might have a profound effect on the children's cognitive achievement. This expectation was not borne out and it was tentatively suggested that perhaps this group of disadvantaged children would learn better in a setting where social interaction acts as an intervening variable for learning, rather than where cognitive achievement per se is stressed.

On the basis of this study, the following over-all conclusions about recruitment can be reached:

1. Many Head Start eligible families need only a small "push" in order to motivate them sufficiently to join.
2. Families which do not apply on their own initiative are more in need than those who apply on their own, if need is defined as a lower level of intellectual functioning on the part of the children and a lower level of aspiration on the part of the parents.
3. Once recruitment has taken place a short-term program has a definite effect in minimizing many of the differences between those recruited and those who come on their own.
4. Since those who do not participate seem to be in the greatest need for service, more adequate methods to attract them must be developed.

In terms of the potential of study findings for immediate application in practice, the following should be noted:

First, there are few among the potential Head Start population who would refuse to come, if contacted appropriately. This generalization appears valid, as it is based upon study data collected in two very different poverty areas. What is needed, however, is a personal contact with a representative of Head Start - it is apparent that reliance upon such as mass media is not sufficient.

Second, those who on their own initiative refer children to Head Start programs have values and aspirations of a nature different from other disadvantaged groups. This is reflected not only in the parents' responses during interviews, but by the intellectual and experiential status of the children, as well. Thus, there is less need for concentrated professional intervention among this group of parents than among parents of other groups of disadvantaged children.

Third, it seems that those parents who contact Head Start on their own behest could form a nucleus, or cadre, of parents who would work with other parents in their neighborhood. This work could take the form of seeking out children for Head Start participation, i.e., establishing the "personal contact between potential participants and Head Start," or with appropriate professional supervision, this cadre could organize a sound, representative parent organization which could work together to further the aims of the Head Start program.

Fourth, and last, it is imperative that efforts be aimed at reaching those who do not contact Head Start

13072

> on their own initiative - for they, and their children, are those who need this enrichment the most. It seems, in many respects, that the "self-referred" are those who are most apt to succeed, in relative terms, even without intervention, while those whose participation often is not secured are those in truly dire need.

It is fortuitous that the means for reaching the unserved already may lie within the Head Start programs: the parents who are "self-referred."

13073

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hollingshead, August B. and Redlich, Frederick C. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Holmes, Douglas and Holmes, Monica. "Evaluation of two Associated YM-YWHA Head Start programs" (Final report of research which was supported, in part, by research grant from Operation Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity - Grant OEO-550). New York: Associated YM-YWHAs, mimeographed, December, 1965.

APPENDICES

13075

EAST TREMONT YM-YWHA
COMMUNITY CENTER

OPERATION HEAD START

1926 CROTONA PARKWAY

BRONX, NEW YORK

FEBRUARY 16, 1966

DEAR MRS.

LAST WEEK SOMEONE FROM THE HEAD START PROGRAM VISITED YOU. YOU SAID YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE YOUR CHILD JOIN THE HEAD START PROGRAM.

IF YOU STILL WANT YOUR CHILD TO JOIN, PLEASE COME AND BRING THE CHILD YOU WANT IN THE PROGRAM TO THE EAST TREMONT COMMUNITY CENTER, AT 1926 CROTONA PARKWAY, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, BETWEEN 9 and 12 IN THE MORNING. THIS WILL BE THE TIME WHEN YOU MAKE PLANS FOR YOUR CHILD'S JOINING THE PROGRAM.

JUST ASK AT THE DESK INSIDE THE CENTER, AND THEY WILL TELL YOU WHERE YOU AND YOUR CHILD ARE TO GO.

IF YOU CAN NOT COME NEXT MONDAY, TELEPHONE (LU 9-4200) OR STOP BY THE CENTER, BEFORE WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, AND LEAVE A MESSAGE FOR MISS KAGLE, TELLING WHAT TIME NEXT WEEK YOU COULD COME.

REMEMBER!! IF YOU WANT YOUR CHILD IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM, YOU AND YOUR CHILD MUST COME TO THE CENTER NEXT MONDAY MORNING, OR LEAVE A MESSAGE FOR MISS KAGLE BEFORE NEXT WEDNESDAY.

13076

HENRIETTA AND STUART HIRSCHMAN
YM-YWHA COMMUNITY CENTER OF
CONEY ISLAND

OPERATION HEAD START

3330 SURF AVENUE

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11224

FEBRUARY 25, 1966

DEAR MRS:

LAST WEEK SOMEONE FROM THE HEAD START PROGRAM VISITED YOU. YOU SAID YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE YOUR CHILD JOIN THE HEAD START PROGRAM.

IF YOU STILL WANT YOUR CHILD TO JOIN, PLEASE COME AND BRING THE CHILD YOU WANT IN THE PROGRAM TO THE HENRIETTA AND STUART HIRSCHMAN YM-YWHA COMMUNITY CENTER OF CONEY ISLAND, AT 3330 SURF AVENUE, BROOKLYN, ON EITHER TUESDAY, MARCH 1 OR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, BETWEEN 9:30 AND 12 IN THE MORNING. THIS WILL BE THE TIME WHEN YOU MAKE PLANS FOR YOUR CHILD'S JOINING THE PROGRAM.

JUST ASK AT THE DESK INSIDE THE CENTER, AND THEY WILL TELL YOU WHERE YOU AND YOUR CHILD ARE TO GO.

IF YOU CAN NOT COME THIS TUESDAY OR WEDNESDAY, TELEPHONE (HI 9 1000) OR STOP BY THE CENTER, BY WEDNESDAY MORNING, MARCH 2. AND LEAVE A MESSAGE FOR MRS. MANDEL TELLING WHAT TIME THIS WEEK YOU COULD COME.

REMEMBER!! IF YOU WANT YOUR CHILD IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM, YOU AND YOUR CHILD MUST COME TO THE CENTER THIS TUESDAY OR WEDNESDAY, OR LEAVE A MESSAGE FOR MRS. MANDEL BY WEDNESDAY MORNING. WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THERE.

13077

STANFORD BINET SUBSCALES

I - COMPREHENSION - JUDGEMENT

Year	Subtest	Maximum No. Points
III-6 #6	Comprehension I	2
IV #6	Comprehension II	2
IV-6 #6	Comprehension III	2
VII #4	Comprehension IV	6

II - ABSTRACT THINKING

Year	Subtests	Maximum No. Points
IV #3, or IV-6 #2	Opposite Analogies I	5
VI #2	Differences	3
VI #5	Opposite Analogies II	4
VII #2	Similarities: Two Things	4
VII #5	Opposite Analogies III	4
VIII #4	Similarities and Differences	4

III A. - VOCABULARY I - PASSIVE RECOGNITION

Year	Subtests	Maximum No. Points
II #3, or II-6 #2	Identifying Parts of the Body	7
II Alternate	Identifying Objects by Name	6
II-6 #1	Identifying Objects by Use	6
IV #4, or IV-6 Alternate	Pictorial Identification	6

13078

III B. - VOCABULARY II - ACTIVE NAMING RECALL

Year	Subtests	Maximum No. Points
II #5, or II-6 #4, or III #2, or IV #1	Picture Vocabulary	18
II-6 #3	Naming Objects	6
V #3	Definitions	3
VI #1	Vocabulary	1 point for each correct definition

IV - VISUAL-MOTOR COORDINATION

Year	Subtests	Maximum No. Points
II #1 or	Three-Hole Form Board	3
II-6 Alternate	Three-Hole Form Board: Rotated	3
II #4	Block Building: Tower	1
III #1	Stringing Beads	1
III #3	Block Building: Bridge	1
III #5	Copying a Circle	1
III #6	Drawing a Vertical Line	1
III-6 #2	Patience Pictures	2
IV #5	Discrimination of Forms	10
V #1	Total of Draw A Man*	6
V #2	Paper Folding	1
V #4	Copying a square	1
V #6	Patience Rectangles	3
V Alternate	Knot	1
VI #6	Maze Tracing	3
VII #3	Copying a Diamond	1
	* DRAW A MAN	
	Legs	1
	Arms	1
	All Features (Face)	1
	Hair	1
	Ears	1
	Ornamentation	1

13079

CHILD'S EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

HS-TT

INTERVIEWER OUTLINE

HELLO! I'M FROM OPERATION HEAD START...YOU'VE PROBABLY HEARD ABOUT OUR PROGRAMS, FOR CHILDREN WHO HAVEN'T BEEN TO SCHOOL YET, BUT WILL BE STARTING SCHOOL SOME TIME IN THE NEXT YEAR.

ARE ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM? (If they are enrolled, ask how they like it, etc; if no children, ask if they think Headstart is helping. In both cases, discontinue interview)

HOW OLD ARE YOUR CHILDREN (If at least 4-1, not yet in school, continue) If no children suitable, ask general question about Headstart and terminate)

(If suitable child) IS HE (SHE) ENROLLED IN ANY NURSERY PROGRAM?
(If no) WELL, LET'S TALK ABOUT HEADSTART FOR HIM (HER)

OH, FIRST OF ALL, HOW MUCH DOES YOUR FAMILY MAKE PER WEEK? (If over $60.00/wk, say: OH, I'M AFRAID HE (SHE) WON'T BE ELIGIBLE FOR HEAD START: ARE THERE ANY OTHER PROGRAMS AROUND - Terminate)

(If eligible) YOUR CHILD COULD JOIN THE HEADSTART PROGRAM. LET ME TELL YOU A LITTLE BIT ABOUT IT. IT'S A NURSERY PROGRAM, RUN AT THE ____________ CENTER. ITS IN OPERATION FIVE DAYS A WEEK, AND RUN BY TRAINED NURSERY SCHOOL TEACHERS. SINCE IT's SUPPORTED BY THE GOVERNMENT, IT DOESN'T COST YOU A PENNY. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN HAVING YOUR CHILD JOIN? (If yes, get name and address on card, and clinch, i.e. tie down to a definite committment from respondent, e.g., when could you come for an interview?)

(If yes) OK - NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT YOUR CHILD DOES EVERY DAY.

(If no) OK - WELL, WE'D VERY MUCH LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT FAMILIES WHO AREN'T INTERESTED IN THE HEADSTART PROGRAM. COULD YOU SPARE SOME TIME RIGHT NOW TO TALK TO US? (If yes, proceed; if No, explain: WE COULD PAY YOU FOR YOUR TIME - AS A MATTER OF FACT, WE COULD PAY YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR CHILD'S TIME - WE'D PAY YOU TEN DOLLARS FOR THE CHANCE TO TALK FIRST WITH YOU, AND THEN WITH YOUR CHILD - RIGHT HERE IN YOUR HOME, IF THAT'S EASIEST FOR YOU)

(If still won't cooperate, terminate by saying: IF YOU DECIDE YOU WOULD LIKE TO HELP US _ OR TO HAVE YOUR CHILD JOING IN HEAD START, YOU CAN WRITE TO THE ____________ COMMUNITY CENTER.

THANK YOU

NAME OF PARENT ______________________

ADDRESS: ______________________

____

13080

2/66

Child's Name ________________________________

Parent (or Guardian) ________________________

Address _____________________________________

Apt. # ______________ Phone # _______________

Status: Head Start ________ Control ___________

Child's Date of Birth ________________________
Mo. Day Year

Ethnic Background: White___ Negro____ P.R.____ Other____

Sex: Male____ Female____

Previous school experience ___________________

Total Family Income: ________________________

Occupation of Major Wage Earner _______________

Education of Major Wage Earner ________________

Father Present: Yes____ No____

Mother Present: Yes____ No____

# of rooms __________

# of siblings in home _________

Ages ________ ________ __________ _________ ________

# of non-siblings and non-parents in home ___________

THESE QUESTIONS ARE TO FIND OUT HOW YOUR CHILD SPENDS HIS (HER) TIME.

TELL ME, WHAT DID HE DO YESTERDAY - AFTER BREAKFAST, BUT BEFORE LUNCH - DID HE:

( ) WATCH TV
( ) GO TO A PLAYGROUND (AFFIRM LOCATION)
( ) GO TO STORES ALONE
( ) GO TO STORES WITH AN ADULT
( ) PLAY AROUND THE HOUSE ALONE
( ) WITH BROTHERS AND SISTERS
( ) WITH FRIENDS
( ) PLAY OUTSIDE
( ) OR WAS HE READ TO
( ) OTHER ____________________

WHICH DID HE DO FOR MOST OF THE TIME ____________________.

WHAT DID HE DO YESTERDAY - AFTER LUNCH, BEFORE GOING TO SLEEP FOR THE NIGHT - DID HE:

( ) WATCH TV
( ) GO TO A PLAYGROUND (AFFIRM LOCATION)
( ) GO TO STORES ALONE
( ) GO TO STORES WITH AN ADULT
( ) PLAY AROUND THE HOUSE ALONG
( ) WITH FRIENDS
( ) WITH BROTHERS AND SISTERS
( ) PLAY OUTSIDE
( ) OR WAS HE READ TO
( ) OTHER____________________

WHICH DID HE DO FOR MOST OF THE TIME ____________________.

13083

WHAT DID HE DO - LAST SATURDAY/SUNDAY - ALL DAY: DID HE -

SAT	SUN	
( )	( )	WATCH TV
( )	( )	GO TO A PLAYGROUND (AFFIRM LOCATION)
( )	( )	GO TO STORES ALONE
( )	( )	GO TO STORES WITH AN ADULT
( )	( )	PLAY AROUND THE HOUSE ALONE
( )	( )	WITH BROTHERS AND SISTERS
( )	( )	WITH FRIENDS
( )	( )	PLAY OUTSIDE
( )	( )	VISIT RELATIONS - WHO? ____________________
( )	( )	GO TO CHURCH
( )	( )	GO TO SUNDAY SCHOOL
( )	( )	MOVIES - WHAT? ____________________
( )	( )	SPECIAL OUTING - WHERE ? ____________________
		__________. WITH WHO? ____________________

WHICH TOOK UP MOST OF THE DAY? - SAT: ____________________

____________________. - SUN: ____________________

____________________.

13033

SOME PEOPLE LIKE TO FEED THEIR CHILDREN SEPARATELY AND THEN HAVE ADULTS EAT - OTHERS PREFER TO HAVE THE WHOLE FAMILY EAT TOGETHER (SORT OF GET THE WHOLE THING OVER WITH AT ONE TIME) - HOW DO YOU HANDLE IT WITH YOUR FAMILY ?

YESTERDAY - DID YOUR CHILD EAT

B	L	D	
( )	( )	( )	ALONE, OR WITH YOUNGER SIBLINGS
( )	( )	( )	WITH MOTHER
( )	( )	( )	WITH FATHER
( )	( )	( )	WITH OLDER BROTHER
( )	( )	( )	WITH OLDER SISTER
( )	( )	( )	WITH OTHER ADULTS

HOW ABOUT LAST SATURDAY AND SUNDAY? (EACH INDIVIDUALLY)

SAT.				SUN.		
B	L	D		B	L	D
( )	( )	( )	ALONE, OR WITH YOUNGER SIBLINGS	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	( )	WITH MOTHER	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	( )	WITH FATHER	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	( )	WITH OLDER BROTHER	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	( )	WITH OLDER SISTER	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	( )	WITH OTHER ADULTS	( )	( )	( )

13084

Categories for "Child Experience Form"

I. CHILD'S ROOM - Circle one

1. No separation of sleep or play area, child sleeps with some adult.
2. Shares room with siblings; same bed
3. Shares room with two (2) or more siblings, separate beds
4. Shares room with one (1) sibling, separate beds
5. Own room; one bed

II. BOOKS

Circle one:

A. No books

B. 0-5 books

C. 5-10 books

D. More than 10 books

Circle one:

1. Adult only
2. Comic books or similar
3. Older siblings' school books
4. Inexpensive children's fiction
5. Children's literature available

III. TOYS

Indicate Separate _____ or Multiple _____ ownership (check one)

III. TOYS

Indicate Separate_____or Multiple_____ownership (check one)

Circle one:

A. No toys in house

B. 0-5 toys in house

C. Fewer than 10 toys in house

D. More than 10 toys in house

Check very specifically the following items:

1. Blocks. Tinker toys. Building toys.
2. Truckes. Cars. Trains. Transportation toys.
3. Puzzles.
4. Paints.
5. Crayons. Scissors. Construction or colored paper.
6. Games: Monopoly. Go for Broke. Candyland. etc.
7. Dolls and doll equipment.
8. Household play equipment: tea sets, pots, telephones
9. Guns, war toys.
10. Sports toys. Balls, etc.
11. Bikes. Roller skates. Skate boards. Skooters. etc.
12. Educational toys. Lotto. Bingo or any matching games. and equipment used to develop color concepts. Letter/word concepts, number concepts. Magnetic alphabet boards. clocks. alphabet blocks. blackboard.
13. Add specific toys where necessary

Cicrle one:

1. Toys not on developmental level of child

2. Few educational toys: mainly inexpensive, non-creative

2. Educational equipment developmentally appropriate.

PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS AND AWARENESS-1

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU A LITTLE ABOUT WHAT YOU THINK ______________
(Child's name) WILL BE DOING WHEN HE GROWS UP.

FIRST, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU EXPECT HIM (HER) TO HAVE? __________

____

____

____.

HOW DO YOU THINK THAT SCHOOL IS GOING TO HELP FOR THIS KIND OF JOB?

____.

WHAT WILL SCHOOL DO FOR HIM/HER? ______________________________

____.

HOW MUCH SCHOOL DO YOU THINK HE'LL NEED?

<JHS: JHS: HS: VHS: COL: > COL:

IF SAID COLLEGE, WHAT COLLEGE WOULD YOU LIKE HIM/HER TO GO TO __________________________. HOW MANY YEARS AFTER HIGH SCHOOL DO YOU THINK IT WILL TAKE FOR HIM TO BECOME A

____.

WHAT WAS THE FIRST FULL TIME JOB YOU (OR HUSBAND, ETC.) EVER HAD?

____.

WHAT OTHER JOBS HAVE YOU (OR PRINCIPAL WAGE EARNER) HAD? List last two ____

NOW A FEW MORE QUESTIONS ABOUT HEAD START: WHAT HAVE YOU HEARD ABOUT IT ____

____

____

____

PEOPLE ARE INTERESTED IN PROGRAMS LIKE THIS FOR DIFFERENT REASONS. WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR REASONS - WHY ARE YOU, OR MIGHT BE, INTERESTED. DO YOU THINK THAT HEAD START DOES THE MOST GOOD BECAUSE

1. ( ) IT HELPS YOU BY KEEPING THE CHILD OUT OF THE HOUSE FOR PART OF THE DAY

2. ( ) HELPS GET THE CHILD READY FOR SCHOOL NEXT YEAR

A LOT OF PEOPLE DON'T WISH TO HAVE THEIR CHILDREN IN HEAD START, OR IN OTHER PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAMS. WHAT ARE REASONS YOU MIGHT FEEL (OR HAVE FELT) THIS WAY? BECAUSE OF, FOR EXAMPLE.

( ) DIFFICULTY IN GETTING THE CHILD THERE AND BACK

( ) NO ONE TO LEAVE OTHER CHILDREN WITH WHILE TAKE THE CHILD

( ) CHILD HAS TO SPEND ENOUGH YEARS IN SCHOOL AS IT IS

( ) I CAN DO MORE FOR THE CHILD AT HOME

WHAT OTHER REASONS MIGHT YOU HAVE?________________________

____

____

____.

FOR "SOUGHT-AFTER": "YES WANT TO SEND CHILD" PARENTS ONLY -

NOW THAT WE'VE ASKED YOU, YOU'VE INDICATED YOUR INTEREST - WHAT KEPT YOU FROM APPLYING TO THE PROGRAM YOURSELF?

( ) NEVER HEARD OF PROGRAM

( ) HEARD OF IT, BUT DIDN'T KNOW WHERE TO GO

( ) HEARD OF IT, BUT WASN'T SURE IT WAS FOR ME

( ) HEARD OF IT AND JUST HADN'T GOTTEN THERE YET

13088

Time II replacement for Time I Parental Aspirations page 2.

NOW SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HEAD START: WHAT DO YOU THINK THE PROGRAM HAS DONE FOR YOUR CHILD?________

(PROBE) DO YOU THINK IT HAS PREPARED HIM FOR KINDERGARTEN OR FIRST GRADE FOR SEPTEMBER?______ HOW?________

HAS HIS PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM MADE ANY DIFFERENCE IN THE WAY HE BEHAVES AT HOME? ______. HOW?________

DOES YOUR CHILD EVER GET TOGETHER WITH ANY OF THE CHILDREN HE OR SHE HAS MET IN HIS CLASS?______ WHOM? (GET NAMES)____

WHAT DO YOU THINK THE PROGRAM HAS DONE FOR YOU?________

(PROBE) HAS IT MADE LIFE ANY EASIER FOR YOU HAVING YOUR CHILD IN SCHOOL?________ IN WHAT WAYS?________

HAVE YOU ATTENDED THE PARENT MEETINGS?______ HOW MANY ______.

AND WHAT HAVE YOUR LEARNED FROM THEM?________

13089

We'd like to know a little more about your neighborhood, so we can get a better idea of what there is for your children.

Are there any day care or nursery school programs?
NO_____ YES_____ - where ________________________.

Any playgrounds? NO____ YES____ - where ____________________.

Are there any Community Centers or other places like Community Centers where you could go? NO___ YES___-where ________________.

What (would you/do) you like to do there?

____

____

____

Has your child (Head Start potential) been to a doctor or hospital/clinic recently?
NO ___ (probe for when last)
YES____ (when, where)

TIME	LOCATION	REASON

Where do you go if you're sick ____________________________.
When did this last happen?

TIME	LOCATION	REASON

What should there be more of in your neighborhood (probe for, e.g., schools, police, etc.)

____

____

____

What do you like best about neighborhood: ______________________
____
____

What do you dislike most ____________________________________
____
____.